

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. LXXXVIII.]

APRIL, 1852.

[VOL. VIII.]

## THE MARQUIS OF ROCKINGHAM AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.\*

THE Earl of Albemarle has our thanks for a very interesting collection of documents illustrating an early portion of the reign of the third George. His own portion of the work is creditable to his political sagacity and literary talents. By descent and by personal conviction a stanch Whig,—occupying the same rank in the Peerage which William III. bestowed, in 1696, on the founder of his family (Arnold Joost, “that gentleman of Guelder,” described by Burnet, who, accompanying the Prince of Orange to England as a page, was in a few years raised to an Earldom),—Lord Albemarle is desirous to place on the canvas the figures and lineaments of some of the Whig statesmen of lesser talents and renown than Chatham and Fox, but who are entitled to remembrance as men whose aim it was “to protect the liberties of the people against the encroachments of the Crown.”

Respectable and excellent as the personal, or rather the domestic, character of George III. was, his political character was very bad. All the new lights recently thrown on his reign, and especially on the interior of his Cabinet, serve to shew the narrowness of his understanding, the scantiness of his attainments, the selfish aims of his indefatigable kingcraft, and the dreadful hollowness and habitual treachery which he practised towards his servants. Few sovereigns have ever ascended the throne with brighter prospects of popularity and his people's love than George III. The first member of his family who was born and educated in the country over which he ruled, he was able in his first address to Parliament to state the fact, and to add that he gloried “in the name of Briton.” Young and not unpleasing in appearance, and speaking the language of his people, though not always, in conversation, with a fluent utterance, he might, too, have easily retained their love. His evil genius was his mother, the Dowager Princess of Wales, who was known to be a woman not merely without knowledge, accomplishments and abilities, but also a person under the evil influence of the Earl of Bute, and habitually selfish and cunning. That she had allowed her son, the heir-presumptive of the British throne, to grow up almost uneducated, stamps her character, intellectual and moral, as of little worth. The first words uttered by George III. on becoming King, were untrue and tricky. The anecdote, which rests on the authority of Horace Walpole, is thus told :

“Early on the 26th of October, 1760, his grandfather, George the Second, had risen apparently in his usual health. At half-past seven of the same

\* *Memoirs of the Marquis of Rockingham and his Contemporaries: with Original Letters and Documents, now first published.* By George Thomas, Earl of Albemarle. 2 vols. 8vo. London—Bentley.

morning he had ceased to breathe. His death took the nation, but not his successor, by surprise. 'The Princess Amelia,' says Walpole, 'as soon as she was certain of her father's death, sent an account of it to the Prince of Wales, but he had already been apprized of it. He was riding, and received a note from a German *valet de chambre*, with a private mark agreed upon between them. Without surprise or emotion, without dropping a word that indicated what had happened, he said his horse was lame, and turned back to Kew. At dismounting, he said to the groom, 'I have said this horse was lame, I forbid you to say to the contrary.'"—I. 7.

The object of George the Third throughout his reign was to extend the boundaries of his prerogative. With this view, he played off one against another the several parties and statesmen who successively bid for the royal favour. The least tractable of the public men of his age, whether in or out of office, was William Pitt, afterwards Lord Chatham. Towards him the hatred of the King was strong, and not less so that the Monarch was sometimes compelled to conceal the feeling and clothe it with smiles and pretended favour. When, in 1761, the "great Commoner," as he was then called, retired indignant from the King's council, thwarted in the affair of the war with Spain, by Bute and the Duke of Newcastle, the King, with consummate treachery, affected to mourn the secession, and proposed to mark his sense of Pitt's services by a peerage to his wife and a pension for three lives to himself. No sooner had Pitt fallen into the well-baited trap, than the Sovereign gratified his revenge by instantly gazetting the frailty of the statesman. Horace Walpole states this was the first instance of a pension being specified in the Gazette. But the malignity was not sufficiently veiled, and Pitt continued to be the most popular man in England; so that the King had the intense mortification, at the City banquet given the following month, to see himself neglected, that the people might pay exclusive honour to Pitt. Afterwards, Lord Chatham's opposition to the American war gave intensity to the King's hatred. He spoke of him in a letter to Lord North, in 1775, as a "trumpet of sedition," and anticipated the time when "decrepitude or death" should put "an end to him."

In 1765, many circumstances concurred to embarrass the King. He was indignant with the Grenville and Bedford Ministry for omitting the name of the Princess Dowager out of the Regency Bill; his efforts through the Duke of Cumberland to supplant the Ministers, by Pitt and Temple, were unsuccessful; and then came the climax of affronts, when the Duke of Bedford in the closet rebuked his royal master for the favour he had shewn to the enemies of his Ministers, and, inveighing against Lord Bute, asked the King whether in respect to "this favourite," as he designated him, the royal promise had been kept? The Minister was bowed out of the closet, and the offer to Pitt eagerly renewed, but again declined, in consequence of Lord Temple's refusal to take office. Then, in despair, the King turned to the Marquis of Rockingham, who had hitherto held no higher post than that of a Lord of the Bedchamber. By him an administration was formed, and for eighteen years he continued to be the head of the great Whig party in England.

Charles Watson Wentworth, second Marquis of Rockingham, was born March 19, 1730, and was the youngest of five sons, who all,



except himself, died in childhood. His father, a descendant of the unfortunate Earl of Strafford, had represented Yorkshire, and in the course of a few years ascended five steps in the Peerage. Soon after he had been raised to an Earldom, by the title of the Earl of Malton, Sir Robert Walpole jocularly said, "I suppose we shall soon see our friend Malton in opposition, for he has had no promotion in the Peerage for the last fortnight." Charles, the second Marquis, was educated at Eton. An anecdote of his youthful days told by Lord Albemarle, shews his loyalty and high spirit :

"At the age of fifteen, he went to Wentworth to pass the Christmas holidays. One morning, he went out hunting, attended by a confidential groom, named Stephen Lobb. Night came on, and neither master nor groom made their appearance. The next day it was reported that Lord Higham and Stephen were seen riding in a northerly direction. A short time afterwards a letter arrived from the truant himself, dated Carlisle, the head-quarters of the Duke of Cumberland, who had just taken the field against the Pretender. Zeal for the Whig cause had impelled him to join the royal army. His family were, or professed to be, much displeased with him for the anxiety his escapade had occasioned them. One only stood up for the youthful volunteer. This was his aunt, Lady Bel Finch, who being of a kindred mind, rejoiced that 'the monkey Charles had shown such a spirit.'"—I. 138, 139.

Before he had attained his majority, his father's death made him heir, in 1750, to the family title and the splendid estates of Wentworth. He did not during the early years of his Marquisate develop strong political tastes, but, influenced by the genius loci of his county, was passionately given to horse-racing. In consideration of his rank and political influence, he was appointed Lord-Lieutenant of the North and West Ridings of Yorkshire, Knight of the Garter, and Lord of the Bedchamber in the Courts of George II. and George III. He quitted the Court of the latter Monarch when, in 1762, William (the fifth) Duke of Devonshire, whom the King's mother called the "prince of the Whigs," was insultingly driven from the royal closet, and resigned his wand as Lord Chamberlain. George the Third did not forget the circumstance; and when, in the course of the following year, Pitt named Lord Rockingham to the King, warmly commended his talents for business, intending at that time to make him First Lord of the Admiralty, the King replied, "I thought I had not two men in my bedchamber of less parts than Lord Rockingham." But even royal resentments cannot be always indulged; and in 1765, George the Third found it expedient to accept this despised Lord of the Bedchamber as his Prime Minister. The Dukes of Newcastle and Grafton, the Earls of Northington and Winchelsea, and General Conway, filled the principal offices under Lord Rockingham. The administration thus formed was greeted with expressions of wonder and contempt, somewhat like those which, at the time we are writing, assail the newly-formed Cabinet of the Earl of Derby and Mr. Benjamin D'Israeli. The cry was then, as now,—“It is an ill-assorted regiment of worn-out veterans, mixed with raw recruits.” Lord Chesterfield wrote of it thus : “It is a jumble of youth and caducity which cannot be efficient.” Charles Townshend cried out, “It is a mere lutestring administration; it is pretty summer wear, but it will never stand the winter.” Lord Rockingham's capacity was certainly not of the highest order, but it

surpassed Lord Liverpool's, whose government was compact and not short-lived. His biographer not unfairly thus sketches his character, and describes the treacherous conduct of the monarch who in his hour of need had called him to his councils :

"Eighteen years the leader of a party, and twice summoned to the councils of his reluctant sovereign, Lord Rockingham holds a prominent station in the reign of George the Third. Nor can it be objected to him that the fidelity of his adherence was secured by the ordinary ties of faction or interest. Faith to their leader was, to the Whigs, a virtual renunciation of all those rewards which a chief magistrate has it in his power to bestow. Their adherence was the loyalty of respect and affection, not the casual allegiance of a cabal. It stood the test of long discouragement. It survived the severer trial of a brief official prosperity. The causes of the attachment of his followers must be sought in the character of the leader himself. Lord Rockingham possessed by nature a calm mind and a clear intellect, a warm benevolent heart, of which amiable and conciliatory manners were the index. He was imbued with sound views of the principles of the Constitution, and with a firm resolution to make those principles the guide of his actions. If eloquence were the sole criterion of a great leader or a great minister, Rockingham would have but small claims to such a title. The malady which consigned him to the tomb, when he was little more than fifty years of age, had imparted to his frame a sensibility of nerve which only extraordinary occasions enabled him to overcome. He was a hesitating and an inelegant debater. His speeches, like those of the late Lord Althorp, commanded attention, not from the enthusiasm aroused by the persuasive arguments of the orator, but from the confidence placed in the thorough integrity and practical good sense of the man. He stood in a similar relation to a great minister—to a Fox, a Grey, or a Russell—which an able chamber-counsel bears to an Erskine. He lacked the outward graces. He possessed the inward power. If success in public measures be a test of ability, Rockingham stood pre-eminent. In no one year between the Revolution and the Reform Bill were so many immunities gained for the people, or, more properly speaking, so many breaches in the Constitution repaired, as in what was contemptuously called his 'Lutestring Administration;' and all too in the face of one of the ablest and most unscrupulous Oppositions, of which the King himself was the head.

"In his relations to George the Third, Rockingham was 'impar congressus Achilli.' He was thoroughly in earnest, but his earnestness was for his country. The King was likewise in earnest, but his earnestness was for his prerogative. The one was all honesty, the other all insincerity. As the reader proceeds, he will find the royal letters most gracious, the royal conduct most disingenuous. He will perceive that the King authorized his ministers to contradict rumours which himself had circulated, and that the 'King's friends' were busily employed in refuting the official statements of the Cabinet. Had George the Third possessed common sincerity, Lord Rockingham's efforts to preserve the American colonies would probably have been effectual. But between the Minister, whose 'virtues were his arts,' and the Monarch, who, like Lysander, pieced the lion's hide with the fox's skin, the struggle was unequal, and Rockingham was arrested in his career of usefulness, and added one more ministerial victim to royal duplicity."—I. 140—142.

Lord Rockingham proved himself a sound and liberal statesman, and his good sense and integrity steered him safely through at least one great political crisis. His name is entitled to honour for his firmness and patriotism in carrying, spite of the passionate wishes and hostile intrigues of the King, the repeal of the Stamp Act. Lord Mahon, influenced by no party prepossessions, admits that Lord Rockingham "had clear good sense and judgment, improved by the trans-



action of business." "His character was without a stain, marked by probity and honour, by fidelity to his engagements and by attachment to his friends."

It is scarcely fair to give, as is sometimes done, to Pitt all the glory of the repeal of the Stamp Act. The principles of Pitt were those professed and carried into action by Lord Rockingham. It was the misfortune, not the fault, of the latter that he could not, notwithstanding repeated solicitations, induce the great Commoner to join his administration. To Lord Rockingham belongs the sole honour of introducing to public life, and fostering with a constant friendship, a man who in the higher attributes of oratory was not inferior to Chatham himself, and who as a political philosopher far surpassed all contemporary statesmen—Edmund Burke. On becoming First Lord of the Treasury, Lord Rockingham, undeterred by the eager and passionately prejudiced dissuasives of his colleague, the Duke of Newcastle, made Burke his private Secretary, seated him in Parliament, first by the aid of the compliant burgesses of Wendover, and afterwards secured for him the obedient suffrages of his good friends the burgesses of Malton. Two years afterwards, Lord Rockingham supplied his gifted Secretary with the means of purchasing the country house which his brilliant fame eventually made celebrated, at Beaconsfield. It was in the debate on the Address, January 1766, that Edmund Burke made his first speech in Parliament. Pitt instantly, with the sympathy of genius, appreciated the talent of the young Member, whom he complimented as "an able advocate." Had Lord Rockingham seen fit to rise superior to the spirit of exclusiveness which has been described as the attribute of the Whig aristocracy from his day to our own, and which jealously reserves all the higher posts of honour for those who belong to a very limited range of aristocratic families, and at once given to Burke a place in his somewhat feeble Cabinet, its tenure of office might have been considerably prolonged.

The King, whose activity and power of detail in business were his own and the nation's misfortune, harassed and weakened the Ministry by much miserable intrigue. His unprincipled wishes and intentions were industriously published, not merely in fashionable saloons, but in government offices and within the walls of Parliament itself, by an active corps of unscrupulous politicians known by the name of "the King's friends." Untrammelled by all thoughts of consistency and character, these political Swiss were ready to vote for or against the Minister, to attend or to absent themselves from divisions, as the royal mover of the wires directed. To us of the present day it seems strange that a Minister of the Crown would allow treacherous servants of this description to swarm in all the lesser posts of government. Notwithstanding the cowardly system, which has latterly been in vogue, of open questions, the Prime Minister of England now exercises a strict discipline over the votes of all his officers. The Duke of Wellington did not for a moment hesitate about the dismissal of Mr. Huskisson, when the latter gave a vote against the government, and Sir Robert Peel wisely enough refused to take office, under circumstances of great political difficulty, so long as any portion of the ministerial patronage (we allude, of course, to the appointment of the Ladies of the Bedchamber) was kept back from him by his Sovereign. Lord Mahon has endea-

voured, in his recently published volumes, to defend the party known in George the Third's time by the name of "the King's friends," alleging as a general principle, "that the most uncompromising asserters of the Crown have often proved no less the sturdiest champions of the people," and that a just pride and a true glory "may spring from the very meekness of legitimate obedience." This apology will not shield from contempt such servile politicians and treacherous official cadets as Lord Barrington, Lord Rockingham's Secretary at War, and Jeremiah Dyson, one of his Lords of Trade. He will be a bold partizan who will claim for these men—and there were nearly a dozen such men holding office under Lord Rockingham—the merit of being champions of popular rights. An anecdote of Dyson will disclose the sort of patriotism which belonged to "the King's friends." Colonel Barré contemptuously styled him Mungo. To explain the title, which stuck to the man like a burr, we must go to the clever farce of the "Padlock." Don Lorenzo puts to his black servant, Mungo, the tickle question, can he "be honest?" Mungo answers, "*What you give me, massa?*"

A political opponent of the Whigs has admitted that Lord Rockingham's intentions were excellent,—as were, for the most part, the measures of his administration. But talents greater than his would not have sufficed to preserve the vitality of an administration bitterly opposed without and treacherously assailed within. It fell within twelve months of its formation. This is Burke's summary of the history of the administration:

"They treated their Sovereign with decency, with reverence. They discountenanced, and it is hoped for ever abolished, the dangerous and unconstitutional practice of removing military officers for their votes in Parliament. They firmly adhered to those friends of liberty, who had run all hazards in its cause, and provided for them in preference to every other claim.

"With the Earl of Bute they had no personal connexion, no correspondence of councils. They neither courted him nor persecuted him. They practised no corruption, nor were they even suspected of it. They sold no offices. They obtained no reversions or pensions, either coming in or going out, for themselves, their families, or their dependents.

"In the prosecution of their measures they were traversed by an opposition of a new and singular character; an opposition of placemen and pensioners. They were supported by the confidence of the nation. And having held their offices under many difficulties and discouragements, they left them at the express command, as they had accepted them at the earnest request of their Royal Master."—I. 370.

Lord Rockingham retired to his seat in Yorkshire, but not before he had received from the merchants of London an address expressive of gratitude for benefits received during his administration, a period short, indeed, but truly memorable for the noblest exertions of a patriot ministry in favour of the civil and commercial interests of the kingdom. Similar addresses were presented from the chief manufacturing and commercial towns of the provinces. The gentlemen and freeholders of his own county received him at York with a procession of two hundred horsemen, and the magistrates and manufacturers of Leeds presented to him an address. For nearly fifteen years Lord Rockingham was doomed to remain in opposition. The wise policy which he had commenced with respect to America, and which, if persevered with in a generous spirit, would have saved the American colonies, was reversed.



The war with America broke out, and disaster upon disaster, during the wretched government of Lord North, befel the country. Lord Rockingham and his party offered a steady, but for a long time ineffectual and almost unheeded, opposition to the insane course pursued by the King's Ministers. When, in 1771, Crosby and Oliver were committed to the Tower for their disrespect to the Speaker's warrant for apprehending Miller, the printer, Lord Rockingham marked his sense of the unconstitutional proceeding by visiting the Lord Mayor and Alderman in the Tower. He was accompanied by Lord Fitzwilliam, the Dukes of Manchester and Portland, Mr. Burke and others. Early in 1782, the administration of "the King's friends" found itself in a minority, subdued by the consequences of the fatal policy which they had from the first pursued. The King was compelled to invite the Whig leader to form a cabinet. The negotiation was opened by Lord Thurlow. Lord Rockingham, true to the noble and generous principles which had been the guide of his political life, refused to take office except on the understanding that American Independence was to be acknowledged, that peace was to be, if possible, everywhere preserved, and that economy should characterize every branch of the government. The King was ultimately compelled to accept him as his Prime Minister on these unwelcome terms. This was about the end of March. The health of Lord Rockingham had, however, now failed him. Water on the chest indicated the approaching close of his career. An attack of influenza prostrated his strength. He appeared for the last time in the House of Lords on June 2. His last speech and vote related to the Bill for disabling Custom-house officers to vote at elections. On the 1st of July he breathed his last.

"On the summit of a well-wooded acclivity, in Wentworth Park, is a mausoleum erected by the affection of the late Earl Fitzwilliam, in memory of his uncle. Under the centre of the dome stands a full-length effigy of Lord Rockingham, surrounded by marble busts of the eight men who shared his public labours and private intimacy. Their names are familiar to the reader of these pages; comprising Keppel, C. J. Fox, Savile, Burke, Portland, Montagu, Lee, Cavendish. On the pedestal of the statue is an inscription by the hand of Burke, which I here subjoin, both because it has hitherto been very incorrectly given, and as containing so true a delineation of this statesman's character.

"CHARLES, MARQUIS OF ROCKINGHAM,

"A man worthy to be held in remembrance, because he did not live for himself. His abilities, industry, and influence, were employed without interruption to the last hour of his life, to give stability to the liberties of his country, security to its landed property, increase to its commerce, independence to its public councils, and concord to its empire. These were his ends. For the attainment of these ends, his policy consisted in sincerity, fidelity, directness, and constancy. His virtues were his arts. In opposition, he respected the principles of Government; in Administration, he provided for the liberties of the people. He employed his moments of power in realising everything which he had proposed in a popular situation—the distinguishing mark of his public conduct. Reserved in profession, sure in performance, he laid the foundation of a solid confidence.

"He far exceeded all other statesmen in the art of drawing together, without the seduction of self-interest, the concurrence and co-operation of various dispositions and abilities of men, whom he assimilated to his character and associated in his labours. For it was his aim through life to convert party connection and personal friendship (which others had rendered subservient

only to temporary views and the purposes of ambition) into a lasting depository of his principles, that their energy should not depend upon his life, nor fluctuate with the intrigues of a Court, or with the capricious fashions amongst the people; but that by securing a succession in support of his maxims, the British Constitution might be preserved, according to its true genius, on ancient foundations, and institutions of tried utility.

"The virtues of his private life, and those which he exerted in the service of the State, were not in him separate principles. His private virtues, without any change in their character, expanded with the occasion into enlarged public affections. The very same tender, benevolent, feeling, liberal mind, which in the internal relations of life conciliated the genuine love of those who see men as they are, rendered him an inflexible patriot. He was devoted to the cause of freedom, not because he was haughty and intractable, but because he was beneficent and humane.

"A sober, unaffected, unpresuming piety, the basis of all sure morality, gave truth and permanence to his virtues.

"He died at a fortunate time, before he could feel, by a decisive proof, that virtue like his must be nourished from its own substance only, and cannot be assured of any external support.

"Let his successors, who daily behold this monument, consider that it was not built to entertain the eye, but to instruct the mind.

"Let them reflect that their conduct will make it their glory or their reproach. Let them feel that similarity of manners, not proximity of blood, gives them an interest in this statue.

"Remember; resemble; persevere."—II. 485—488.

Lord Albemarle's volumes contain various letters and notices of William, Duke of Cumberland, who was a zealous Whig and a close political and personal friend of the Marquis of Rockingham. Latterly his name has been almost exclusively associated with the severities of his army in the Highlands subsequent to the battle of Culloden, which gained for him the discreditable *soubriquet* of "the Butcher." He had, however, many excellent qualities, and at his death the voice of lamentation from Dissenting pulpits was loud and general.\* An anecdote told by Lord Mahon illustrates the strong attachment of the Duke of Cumberland to liberal politics. On one occasion, in the lobby of the House of Lords, he addressed Dr. Price with an expression of his warm admiration of the Doctor's admirable pamphlet on the American struggle. "I sat up to read it last night so late," said the Duke, "that it had almost blinded me!" "On the greater part of the nation," observed Dunning, who was standing by, "it has had exactly the opposite effect,—it has opened their eyes!"

Amongst the patriotic men who gave to Lord Rockingham a zealous and independent support, none stands higher than Sir George Savile.

"The Premier's friend, Sir George Savile, was invited to take part in the Rockingham Administration. But with his habitual delicacy and candour he declined the offer, alleging that, as an independent Member of Parliament, he could better assert his privileges and serve his friends. Faction has spared

\* Funeral sermons for the Duke were printed by Dr. Toulmin, Mr. Corbyn and others. The latter styled him a "personage illustrious by his birth and by his exploits, great in public and amiable in private life, \* \* \* a prince, a hero and a patriot." After the battle of Culloden, the Three Denominations of Dissenters presented to George II. an address of congratulation, in which they speak of William his son as an "illustrious royal youth, early treading the paths of glory, a scourge of his country's enemies, and a general blessing to these favoured kingdoms."—*Gentleman's Magazine*, XVI. 327.



the name of Savile: contemporaries are unanimous in representing him as in the highest degree generous, benevolent, disinterested and unostentatious—a high commendation in an age where mere negative virtues were rare, and statesmen imitated the maxims rather than the practice of Sir Robert Walpole. In person Savile was somewhat above the middle size; his figure was slender, his complexion adust, his constitution delicate; his address was easy, and almost bordering upon negligence. As an orator he possessed great facility of utterance, and was simple even to austerity in the choice of his words. In debate he was clear, sensible and persuasive. A peculiar radiance spread over his features whenever philanthropy was the theme of his discourse. Indeed, the general belief in the honesty and benevolence of his intentions produced such an impression in favour of his arguments, that ‘Truth came mended from his tongue.’ His habits of thinking were very original. ‘He had a head,’ Walpole remarks, ‘as acutely argumentative as if it had been made by a German logician for a model.’ He was a shrewd observer of contemporary statesmen. He predicted early the future greatness of Charles Fox. When that statesman was scarcely a man, he praised him for his readiness in finding out *blots*—his celerity in hitting the bird’s-eye of an argument, and his general talents for opposition. ‘Hence,’ said Savile, ‘others may have more stock, but Fox has more ready money about him than any of his party.’

“Toleration in matters of religion is a doctrine of comparatively recent growth. It was imperfectly understood by the Whigs of the last century, who combined the ideas of Protestantism and the Hanoverian succession. It was utterly unknown to their political opponents, who recognized the Church of England as the sole Church of Christ; but Savile was an honourable exception to both these extremes. He advocated the claims of the Roman Catholics, and his advocacy exposed him to the fury of the Church and King mobs of the year ’80; and yet, even while his house was assailed, and frequent attempts were made to set it on fire, he spoke of the incendiaries with compassion, and ascribed the zeal of the multitude rather to their ignorance than to their evil passions, rather to their being led by blind guides than to the spontaneous aberration of their own feelings.

“Savile’s conduct on this occasion was highly characteristic. Several of his friends agreed to sit up with him during the night for the protection of his family. It was arranged amongst them that parties from time to time should sally forth in search of intelligence respecting the riots, but, as their accounts varied from each other, Savile said, with great composure, ‘Here, gentleman, is a fine lesson for an historian. We have a fact of the day before us, reported by men of integrity and ability, anxious to search for truth, and willing to record it with as much circumstance and minuteness as possible. Yet, such is the nature of the human mind, that with all its inclinations to do right, it is under that operation which in some degree prevents it.’

“Such was this wise and virtuous citizen, who indeed exhibited in his character many of the qualities which the Roman satirist ascribes to the senator Crispus:

“‘Cujus erant mores, qualis facundia, mite  
Ingenium: maria ac terras populosque regenti  
Quis comes utilior?’”—I. 227—230.

As a contrast to the portrait of this highminded man, we extract Lord Albemarle’s account of one of Lord Rockingham’s opponents, in whose favour the Crown granted, in 1768, a lease of an extraordinary character, in the hope that he might by the powers contained in it strip the Duke of Portland, an opposition Peer, of a valuable estate.

“Sir James Lowther, known later as the ‘bad Lord Lonsdale,’ was a strange compound of pride, eccentricity, caprice, and cruelty. He was long called ‘the petty tyrant of the north.’ If he possessed any redeeming quality, it was, as Peter Pindar says, in his celebrated ode to him,

‘A farthing rushlight to a world of shade.’

His fiery and overbearing character is indicated in his conduct on the attainment of his earldom. He was created with three others to this dignity. His co-peers had all held ancient baronies. He had overleaped the two lower grades of nobility. Indignant, however, at finding that his name was the last on the batch, he forced his way into the House of Commons, and would have seated himself on the opposition benches, as if he had been still a member, had he not been withheld by main force by the Serjeant-at-Arms and his deputy, who were obliged to grasp the hilts of their swords before they could restrain him from accomplishing his purpose. Lord Lieutenant of Cumberland and Westmoreland, and possessor of an immense estate, Lowther employed the power he derived from these sources in acts of oppression. He assumed the haughty demeanour of a feudal chieftain, and exacted a serf-like submission from his poor and abject dependents. He professed a thorough contempt for modern refinements. Grass grew in the neglected approaches to his mansion. If he had occasion to go from Lowther to Penrith, it would be in a rusty old coach, drawn by fine, but untrimmed, horses. Awe and silence pervaded the inhabitants when the gloomy despot traversed their streets. He might have been taken for a Judge Jefferies, about to open a royal commission to try them as state criminals. Clarendon says of a certain Earl of Arundel, that 'he went sometimes to London, because there only he found a greater man than himself, because at home he was allowed to forget that there was such a man.' The visit of Lord Lonsdale to the metropolis failed to produce this conviction of inferiority. Once, on a levee day, he desired his coachman to break through the line of carriages conveying parties to Court. His coach was stopped by a Life Guardsman, but the loud menaces of this 'leviathan of two counties' so perplexed the trooper that he would fain have let him go. The officer on duty, however, ordered two of his men to seize the horses' heads, and to turn them into Piccadilly. Lonsdale threw the officer his card, and a duel ensued. The injustice of his quarrel rendered it difficult for him to find a second. At last, Sir William Lowther, his cousin, and his successor in the earldom, undertook the office. By a will, dated the same day on which the duel was fought, Sir William became eventually possessed of a large property which did not necessarily accompany the title. Another anecdote is related of Lord Lonsdale.

"He induced the daughter of a Cumberland farmer to leave her home, and place herself under his protection. Whilst yet young and beautiful the poor girl died. He caused her to be embalmed, and a glass case to be placed over the face, that he might recal to memory the features of one of the few persons for whom he entertained an affection.

"His despotic disposition manifested itself on every occasion. Speaking of Whitehaven, of which borough he was the patron, he said he was in the possession of the land, the fire, and the water of that town,—a boast which is thus mentioned in the *Rolliad*:

"'E'en by the elements his power confess'd,  
Of mines and boroughs Lonsdale stands possess'd,  
And one sad servitude alike denotes  
The slave that labours and the slave that votes.'

"In some years of his life, he resisted the payment of all bills. If the creditors were neighbours, my Lord 'knew them to be knaves.' If they lived at a distance, 'how could his Lordship know what they were?' In this latter category stood the father of William Wordsworth, who died, leaving the poet and four other helpless children. The executors of the will, foreseeing the result of a legal contest with a *millionaire*, withdrew opposition, trusting to Lord Lonsdale's sense of justice for payment. They leaned on a broken reed; the wealthy debtor

"'Died and made no sign!'"—II. 70—72.

The Duke of Grafton (Augustus Henry Fitzroy, the third Duke) was Secretary of State in Lord Rockingham's first administration. The



political career of this nobleman was not very consistent or successful. An able apology for his mistakes was put forth by the late Rev. Thomas Belsham (Funeral Sermon for the Duke of Grafton, note, pp. 40, 41). But it is clear from Mr. Belsham's statements, which he gives "upon the best authority," that the Duke erred against his own convictions in continuing in the Ministry of the Earl of Chatham after the imposition of the tea duty, which occasioned the American war. Still more grievously did he err in joining, in 1771, the government of Lord North. In 1775, he saw his errors, withdrew from the Ministry, explaining very distinctly his views to the King, and went into opposition to Lord North. After his retirement from active political life, the Duke of Grafton became a thoughtful student of theology, and it is well known that his inquiries led him to renounce orthodox and embrace Unitarian opinions. Unlike many other men of rank, he publicly professed the opinions he had deliberately formed,—sought, in 1789, the acquaintance and friendship of Theophilus Lindsey,—and thenceforward during the rest of his life was a regular and exemplary attendant at Essex-Street chapel. Of the progress of his religious opinions Mr. Belsham has left us an interesting record, both in his *Life of Mr. Lindsey* (pp. 320—336) and in his *Funeral Sermon for the Duke* (pp. 38—53). Lord Albemarle gives us his personal recollections of the Duke.

"His grace was not fond of children; they came in for no share of his 'endearing condescension.' I have a lively recollection of the awe with which he inspired me. As the Duke's and my father's country houses in Suffolk were only four miles distant, and the families were on intimate terms, I had frequent opportunities of seeing him during the first twelve years of my life. On some occasions I saw him in the luncheon room at Euston Hall, but this was a rare occurrence, for I was generally hurried out of the room whenever he was expected. I used mostly to meet him riding. He was usually mounted on a fiery, thorough-bred horse, on which he sat with much ease and dignity. I know not how far local traditions may have mixed with personal recollections, but the 'mind's eye' presents the picture of an elderly gentleman, of spare form, middle stature, straight silver hair, a prominent nose, and a countenance of much severity; and dressed in a light-coloured, tight-fitting coat, long black boots, and a small three-cornered hat. But it was not to us little people only that the 'Junius Duke of Grafton' was formidable. From the accounts I have heard his nephew, the late General William Fitzroy, give of him, he was evidently an object of terror to

"'Children of a larger growth.'"—I. 223, 224.

The Marquis of Rockingham's Solicitor-General in 1782 was "honest Jack Lee." Thus does Lord Albemarle's account of him open:

"The family of Lee has been of considerable standing and influence in the town of Leeds since the early part of the sixteenth century.\* None of its members, however, attained to such contemporary eminence as John, or, as he was popularly called, 'honest Jack Lee.'

"John Lee, the youngest of ten children, was born in the year 1733, and, by his father's decease in 1736, was left an orphan at the early age of three years. In his mother, however, he possessed an equally tender and sagacious guardian, and apparently inherited from her his superior abilities. 'She was, says the manuscript biography, 'a woman of superior talents and great virtues. Mrs. Lee continued, as she had been educated, a Protestant Dissenter; but

\* "This and other passages within an inverted comma, are extracts from a short biographical memoir of Lee, drawn up by his widow."

she nevertheless designed her son for the Established Church—a determination in which she was somewhat influenced by her intimate friend, Archbishop Secker.’

“But, although a strictly religious man, Lee’s spirits were too boisterous, his manners too blunt, and his wit was too little under control, for the clerical profession.”—II. 106, 107.

In this statement there is a grievous suppression of a most important fact. John Lee, whatever might be his mother’s designs, was too honest to profess conformity to the “Established Church.” There was a stronger reason than boisterous spirits, blunt manners and exuberant wit, for his not entering the clerical profession—he was a *firm Unitarian*. Of this there can be adduced unexceptionable testimony. In his autobiography, Dr. Priestley tells us that on settling at Leeds as minister of the Mill-Hill congregation began his intercourse with Mr. Lee, *who was at that time particularly connected with the congregation*. The vacations he spent previously to his marriage in Dr. Priestley’s house. His subsequent political connections and professional honours did not affect him. Dr. Priestley says of him, “He always preserved his attachment to theology and the cause of truth.” The Sunday evenings were for several years passed by Dr. Priestley and Mr. Lindsey at Mr. Lee’s house in Lincoln’s Inn. “Seldom,” said the Dr., “have I enjoyed society with more relish.” Mr. Lindsey says these Sunday evening meetings were continued for nearly twenty years, and adds, “Two men more formed and furnished for social converse than Dr. Priestley and Mr. Lee are rarely found.”

In 1774, Mr. Lindsey opened the chapel at Essex Street. Mr. Lee was one of his most zealous supporters. When Lord Ward and the Middlesex magistrates hesitated about granting a licence for the chapel, Mr. Lee left the Court of King’s Bench, where he was engaged, and entered Hickes’s Hall “like a lion,” and with arguments and in a tone of voice which subdued or abashed the bigotry of the bench, complained of the obstructions that had been put in the way of a perfectly legal demand, saying that if necessary a mandamus from the King’s Bench would compel them to give the required licence, but that “he hoped the great Magna Charta of the religious liberty of Englishmen was not now going to be attacked.” The deep interest felt by Mr. Lee in Mr. Lindsey’s opening services he recorded in a letter to Rev. Newcome Cappe, of York, preserved in the Life of Lindsey (p. 111, note). In 1783, Mr. Lee made one of the newly-formed society for promoting the knowledge of the Scriptures, the meetings of which were held at Essex House, and the fruits of which were the two volumes of “Commentaries and Essays.” It was at Mr. Lee’s suggestion, jointly with that of Baron Maseres, that Mr. Lindsey, in publishing the third edition of his Reformed Liturgy in 1793, changed the three-fold address retained in the Liturgy to one solemn invocation. Mr. Lee thought that the three-fold address tended to keep up the old impression of a three-fold nature in the Deity.

We have thus adduced evidence of Mr. Lee’s uncompromising Non-conformity and Unitarianism from the year 1768 to 1793, the last of his life. It is to be regretted that his great nephew, the Rev. Charles Lee, should have ignorantly\* or inadvertently withheld from Lord

\* The mistake may have originated in simple ignorance. The writer was not



Albemarle all knowledge of the opinions of his *honest* ancestor. O the education of Mr. Lee no particulars are given. Selecting the law as his profession, for which he had many eminent qualifications, he entered at Lincoln's Inn. On being called, he proceeded, with the instinct of a Yorkshireman, to the Northern circuit.

"His commencement, like that of Pratt and of so many lawyers subsequently eminent, was extremely unpropitious. Dining one day with his friends, Davenport and Wedderburn, Lee declared that 'he found a prophet had no honour in his own country, and that, as he never received a single guinea in York, he would shake the dust off his feet, and leave it the next morning, never to return again.'

"As soon as he left the room, Davenport and Wedderburn concocted a brief together, which they entitled, 'The King against the inhabitants of Hum Town, for not repairing a highway,' and sent it with a guinea to Lee's lodgings. When Wedderburn met Lee in the circuit room in the evening, he expressed surprise at seeing him. Jack replied, 'I was just shaking the dust off my feet, when lo! a brief is brought me,' and showed the indictment of 'the King against the inhabitants of Hum Town.' 'Ah!' said Davenport, 'they brought me a brief in that case with a bad guinea, so I returned it.' Lee showed his guinea; Davenport put it in his pocket, and told him the hoax had been played upon him that his friends might have the benefit of his company a little longer at York. 'Though,' says Lord Eldon, who tells the story, 'Lee was a very good-tempered man, he never forgave the joke.'

"'But he did not go next morning?' inquired Miss Forster, Lord Eldon's niece. 'No,' was the reply, 'he did not; and he led almost every cause, but that was the beginning.'

"That Lee possessed extraordinary skill and learning in his profession is attested by Lord Eldon and other contemporary and junior members of the Northern Circuit. His ready eloquence and humour were equally serviceable in leading a jury or cross-examining a witness. 'Of John Lee,' said Lord Eldon, in his anecdote-book, 'I love to indulge in the remembrance. To me he was most kind in my younger days. He was a very powerful cross-examiner of a witness. I remember a witness remonstrating against the torture of his cross-examination. The man, who was clothed in rags, said, 'Sir, you treat me very harshly, and I feel it the more because we are relations.' 'We relations, fellow!' said Lee, 'how do you make that out?' 'Why,' said the man, 'my mother was such a person, and she was the daughter of such a man, and he was the son of a woman, who was the daughter of the person (naming him) who was your great-great-grandfather.' 'Well,' said Lee, 'you are right; he was so. And then, my good cousin—my good fourth or fifth cousin—speak a little truth, I beseech thee, for the honour of the family, for not one word of truth, cousin, hast thou spoken yet.'"—II. 107—109.

Lee was engaged as the counsel for the freeholders of Middlesex, when Luttrell deprived Wilkes of his rightful seat for the metropolitan county. In 1769 and 1770, he refused, in the exercise of what he deemed fidelity to Lord Rockingham, a seat in Parliament, a silk gown and the office of Solicitor-General to the Queen. He had been just before chosen Recorder of Doncaster. In 1778, he was retained, together with Dunning and Erskine, for the defence of Admiral Keppel. After his honourable acquittal, the grateful Admiral sent to each of his three counsel a fee of a thousand pounds. Lee returned the fee, and begged,

---

many years ago asked by a Member of Parliament and the brother of a Peer, "Pray what does *Unitarianism* mean?" And yet the father of the querist (a Baronet and an under Secretary of State) was not merely a Unitarian, but the author of an elaborate pamphlet in defence of Unitarian opinions.

in lieu of it, the Admiral's portrait. Lee was a formidable opponent of Lord North's administration. Lord Brougham, in his account of the forces arrayed against that imperturbable statesman, mentions the broad humour and argumentary sarcasm of Lee.

In 1780, Lord Rockingham asked Lee to assist him with his "sound sense and integrity," and when that statesman was again called to office, he appointed Lee his Solicitor-General, who took his seat as Member for Clithero. On the formation of the Coalition Ministry, Mr. Lee was again made Solicitor, and in 1783, on the death of Mr. Wallace, he became Attorney-General. On the dismissal of the Duke of Portland, he, in the company of his political friends, quitted office.

Eager political partizan as he was, his friends were of all parties, including Dr. Paley, John Scott, afterwards Lord Eldon, and his distinguished brother William, afterwards Lord Stowell. He assisted the latter to become Advocate of the Admiralty, who, while acknowledging to all the prejudices of a True-Blue education at Oxford, assured his friend that he should always rejoice to see his "Presbyterian pipe smoked at Doctors' Commons." This was in 1785, and the jocular expression shews that Lord Stowell knew more of John Lee's theological position than do his descendants. An unfortunate accident, the starting of a horse, gave him a wrench which laid the foundation of a cancer. His sufferings were very great.

"Lee had been prevailed upon to consult a celebrated medical practitioner in Newcastle in the later stage of his disease. This gentleman, though a pattern of veracity on all occasions, had made it a rule never to risk the shock which his patients might experience on being told that he was destitute of hope of their recovery. Upon opening his waistcoat in order to afford Mr. Ingham an opportunity of examining his side, the latter although led to speak cheerfully and encouragingly, his patient replied: 'Mr. Ingham, I have studied the human countenance too long not to read your real opinion in yours. I see perfectly what it is.' And when he left the room, he (Mr. Lee) observed, 'That man has signed my death warrant.'"—II. 129, 130.

Early in the year 1793, he wrote thus to Mr. Lindsey: "Though my bodily pain exceeds anything of the kind I ever endured, and makes me totally unable to sleep without opiates, yet I steal a few minutes of comparative ease to thank you for your very pretty book of Paley's, which I like very much. The baseness of Fox's deserters excites my indignation. If God give me health to travel, I hope I shall not desert my old corps."

Death terminated his sufferings, Aug. 5, 1793, when he was in his 61st year, and his remains were interred in Staindrop church, Durham.

Sincerely was he mourned by men of very various ranks. Lord Fitzwilliam expressed his "infinite concern" at the death of his friend, adding, "Among the numberless admirers of the open, ingenuous and honourable public character of Mr. Lee, and among those attached to the amiable and social virtues of his private life, not one is to be found more an admirer of the first, nor more attached to the latter, than I have always been; he is a great loss in both points of view."

In his "Conversations on the Divine Government," Mr. Lindsey speaks of Mr. Lee as "a very able and most valuable Christian character, to whose friendship, virtues and memory, my heart pays the most affectionate and grateful tribute." (P. 140, note.)



At various periods of his life, Dr. Priestley expressed publicly and privately his admiration for John Lee. By his advice, the Dr. wrote, in 1769, his critique on that portion of Blackstone's Commentaries in which Dissenters are handled. In 1778, he dedicated to Lee his friendly discussion with Dr. Price on Matter and Spirit. The sitting-room of the great Christian philosopher in his quiet retreat at Northumberland, on the other side of the Atlantic, was adorned with the portraits of four friends,—Mr. Lindsey, Professor Hutchinson, Dr. Price and Mr. Lee. To Mr. Lindsey, the survivor of them all, he said, speaking of the pleasure he found in looking at the portraits, "Though dead, they seem to speak, and tend to inspire good sentiments." In the solitude and sorrows of his last years, Dr. Priestley found consolation in thinking of them as friends whom, with assured Christian hope, he trusted to meet in another world.

In dismissing the very interesting volumes before us, we cannot refrain from expressing regret at the unnecessarily hostile tone adopted towards Lord Chatham. His errors were not inconsiderable; many of them grew out of a very disordered frame. His temper, never good, was exacerbated by chronic disease. But his career, candidly surveyed, was that of a patriot; and as an orator, his genius was, in England at least, never surpassed. It is no disparagement to Lord Rockingham, that in the attributes of eloquence he was immeasurably inferior to Pitt; it is his lasting honour that, by his fidelity to his principles and his friends, and by his virtues, public and private, he founded and for nearly twenty years presided over the great Whig party of England, and defended the constitution and the liberties of the people from the encroachments of the royal prerogative. It has been remarked that his position and talents were akin to those of the late Lord Althorp. Compared with the brilliant oratory of Lord Brougham, Althorp's utterance was faltering and his style rude; but the manly worth, the political consistency, and the sweetness of temper, of the leader of the reformed House of Commons, rendered services to his party and his country of greater value than any rendered by the somewhat eccentric genius of the then Lord Chancellor.

---

#### MR. BAXTER AND DR. OWEN.

MR. GILBERT told a friend he had been to visit Mr. Baxter that morning, whom he found hard at study, and expressed himself to be very desirous that God would spare his life till he had finished some studies and thoughts he was about for the church of God. "Truly," said Mr. Gilbert, "I think you are in the right on't. You may do God more service here on earth than you can do in heaven;" which saying pleased Mr. B. mightily, and made him paraphrase upon it. From him, Mr. Gilbert went to Dr. Owen, whom he found grunting and weary, and wishing himself out of this world. "See," said Mr. Gilbert, "how you two great men, Mr. B. and you, that could never agree in your lives, cannot hit it in the matter and manner of your dying." "Why," saith the Doctor, "what saith Mr. Baxter?" So Mr. Gilbert told him the story; "And," saith he, "I think Mr. Baxter is in the right on't." "Who is in the right and who is in the wrong," said Dr. Owen, "I know not; but I would that I was in heaven."—*Dr. Henry Sampson's Day Books—Gent. Mag.*

SOCIAL INFLUENCES OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, AS  
ILLUSTRATED MORE ESPECIALLY BY CONFESSION.

SEVERAL years have elapsed since I addressed you a series of letters on kindred subjects with that announced in the title of this article. Since then my views have been somewhat modified; the romantic aspect which everything assumed, has vanished on a nearer insight into them; and though the facts I described remain substantially the same, the colours with which I now would clothe them are very different from those of *couleur de rose*. In fact, my first impressions have been effaced; the romance of glowing painting and melodious masses of pompous fêtes and Papal benedictions has passed away, and on these illusions I now can look as only on the painted exhalation which hangs over and conceals the stagnant and noisome marsh below. Let not this, in the spurious language of the day, be called illiberal. I simply exercise a right, which I concede to others, of speaking of things as they appear to me to be, without wishing to curtail the freedom of any man to think and act as he pleases in matters of religion. Let poison be sold if purchasers apply, but at least let it be labelled; and in labelling what I deem to be poison, I have acquired some right to speak from the near and intimate view I have had of the subject under consideration. There is a broad, undeniable fact which stares the mere summer tourist in the face, and that is the immense difference which exists between those countries where the Protestant or Roman Catholic religions are professed. Cross that insensible, conventional line which separates one Swiss canton from another, and you are convinced of the truth of this assertion. Travel through Italy, and you are still more struck with the appalling difference—filth and disorder amidst aspects of nature full of grace and beauty; and, what is worse still, moral filth and moral disorder where the voice of God, more than in any country with which I am acquainted, seems to proclaim the beauty of holiness. I am told, too, that the same facts are observable in other countries where the Roman Catholic religion is honestly carried out. Now what explanation are we to adopt for resemblances and contrasts so uniform and undeniable? For myself, I can see no other than in the religions which are professed and adopted in the respective countries; and so convinced am I of the truth of this, that I am persuaded that for Italy there is no chance of political liberty or social elevation until the Roman Catholic religion be crippled and curtailed of its power. Often and often have I desired during the last two years, when the fiery contest of opinion has raged as it has done in England, that you and others could have witnessed what I daily look upon; that whilst many have been dazzled by the novelty and brilliancy of the robes of a Cardinal, and infatuated by the learning of a Newman, they could here have seen the legitimate consequences of principles and practices which have met with some temporary favour in my dear native land. “Not the legitimate consequences of the religion,” you will reply. “Surely you will not tax it with all the social enormities which one witnesses in Italy. It does not produce such effects in England.” This, I find, is a general delusion amongst the more enlightened who *call* themselves Roman Catholics; and because there are principles in operation which in a great measure neutralize the poison administered



by that Church, they think that it is much and undeservedly abused ; whilst the pseudo-liberals pronounce it not so bad after all, and call out for fair play. But the spirit of that Church is unchanged and unchangeable,—grasping in its ambition,—unwearied in its perseverance,—then most hopeful when apparently the most cast down,—unscrupulous in its means of attaining any object,—insinuating or audacious, conceding or exacting, humble or tyrannical by turns, as circumstances may dictate ; and wherever it gains admission, be assured that all its power will be exerted to fascinate the unwary, and to weaken and undermine the principles which it cannot so openly attack. Such I believe to be, after much experience, a faithful character of a Church, the boast of which is that it is unchangeable, and which has reduced this fair country to its present deplorable state of political and spiritual bondage.

I now, then, enter on the principal object of this letter, which is to describe certain social phases in Italy, and to shew what connection they may have with the religion here professed, and more especially with the sacrament of Confession. It is a heavy charge to bring against a whole people, but when I say that the Italians, and especially the Neapolitans, have neither honesty, nor truthfulness, nor self-respect, I am stating the simple fact ; and so would it be with the English, were they, too, under similar influences. To such an extent, indeed, is this true, that I have sometimes fancied that all moral distinctions between truth and falsehood were abolished, since they appeared to me to lie without motive, or for amusement, or as an exercise of ingenuity. Hence friendship is but a name: a man will sell or betray his most intimate acquaintance for interest ; he will cheat you and lie to your face, and, if discovered, pass it off as a “*cosa di niente*,” or treat it as a clever joke. In matters of opinion, he will be as double-faced as Janus ; in one company he will laud his “*Ottimo Sovrano*” to the skies, and weep over a royal decree (fact) from very exuberance of affectionate loyalty which it awakens, whilst elsewhere he will send his soul not to Paradise. To the priest he will speak of holy Mother Church with the utmost enthusiasm, and to his confidential friend, if in such an illusion he believes, he will send not merely the Pope and the Saints to the devil, but everything associated with religion. Thus in every social relation there is a hollowness and insincerity which, induced by a kind of moral necessity, have at length settled down into the national character. A case in point occurs to me. I was lately in society where two gentlemen were praising a mutual friend as an “*excellente persona*.” “*Ah!*” said one, “*sa a mascherare—he knows how to wear a mask*.” “*Yes*,” said the other, “*it is a great virtue*.” “*Your observation*,” I said, “*makes a strong impression on me. What must be the state of the country where men such as you can make a merit of hypocrisy?*” “*We cannot afford to be honest*,” was the reply ; “*for my part, I am not made for a martyr*.” That seven lies, too, constitute a mortal sin, I have already told you is the calculation of the priestly scale ; and, in conformity with this, often have I been assured that a falsehood cannot be wrong when it does no harm to any one. This was, however, rather a begging of the question, I thought. Now, to what is this general insincerity to be attributed ? To no degeneracy of race, certainly ; for there is not a nation in Europe who possess finer elements of character

than do these same unfortunate Italians; but rather to that canker in the heart of the country—that worm in the bud, which gnaws into the germ of every moral and intellectual excellence—the Holy Apostolic Roman Catholic Church. Its influence is twofold, direct and indirect; yet in either case ordered by the most cunning design. The most perfect despot on the face of the earth, it claims empire even over the mind; and though its own history abounds with proofs of fallibility and corruption, it admits not even the shadow of a turning from what it lays down as right or convenient in principle. Hence, like all despots, it rules by fear, and thus produces the necessary consequences—hypocrisy, fraud and suspicion. These, I believe, will follow from that religion, in whatever country it is professed, as necessarily as darkness follows the setting sun; and though civilization may diminish the degree of the evil, yet wherever it is, there will be always certain mental and moral signs by which its presence may be discovered. Here, however, where that Church is not crippled, where her spirit is thoroughly developed, and where she wields the temporal power, her influence is irresistible, and fear produces its worst consequences. Like the hundred-handed Briareus, its grasp is everywhere; its instruments are at work in the court, in the police-office, in the confessional, in the family circle,—wherever two or three are gathered in the name of Christ,—but nowhere is its power more terrible than in the confessional. There it acquires a knowledge which it exercises most despotically; there is it that political liberty is destroyed; that all social confidence is undermined; that the wife or the daughter may and do unconsciously become the betrayer of the husband or the parent; that all female delicacy is undermined; and that Italians necessarily become suspicious, faithless, regardless of truth. When first I visited Italy, as I have already told you, I was so fascinated by the grace and beauty of externals, that I was content with a cold protest against the principles of the Roman Catholic Church. I did not perceive or appreciate the dire consequences which they produced. As a stranger on his first arrival in Naples visits the Campo Santo (the Public Cemetery), and, heedless of the signs of mortality which lie around him, of the corruption beneath, and of the worms which, after battenning below, rise to the surface and crawl under his feet, looks around upon flowers and shrubs and graceful architecture, and more distantly on the lovely bay with its classic coast, so was it with me; I was blind to the worms and corruption, and saw only those superficial aspects of religion which, I confess, for the time fascinated me. Time has, however, opened my eyes, and I do therefore hold it to be a duty to lift the veil and discover what it conceals.

The theory of Confession, it cannot be denied, is most perfect; it embraces the wisdom of the counsellor, the affection of a friend, the compassion and tenderness of a parent; and were that counsellor, friend and parent perfect, the practice would be as beautiful as the theory. But look at that female penitent bending before the confessional; her black lace veil rests lightly on her glossy locks, and falls gracefully over her shoulders, and altogether she presents as lovely a picture as painting or poetry could desire. Her reverend confessor, lolling in his box, like a sentinel taking it easy, inclines his ear to the perforated plate which is supposed to cut off all communication, except that of



sound, between him and his fair penitent—and no doubt the supposition is correct. God forbid that it should be otherwise. Ever and anon he raises himself to take a pinch of snuff, for this confession is a tedious work, and requires something to titillate the brains. What takes place within the confessional—ah! that depends on a hundred circumstances—on the age and character and mental qualifications and education of both the priest and the penitent. Here we must leave the theory of confession, which is divine, and take a practical view of it which is both true and human. Our penitent may, under the full impression of her creed that she is revealing all her thoughts to one empowered by God to absolve her, make a clean bosom, and she may from many a good and honest priest receive such counsel or consolation as his heart or head enables him to give. So far good. But let us take other views of the case, equally probable, equally true. Our penitent shall be just budding into youth, with the first blush of virgin modesty on her cheek. “The Angelic Guide to Eternal Happiness” is put into her hands, where are directions given for preparation for confession, and amongst other directions the following: “Examine all sins which consist in actions, such as taking with yourself or others sensual liberties, permitting lascivious kisses, secret touches, and infamous practices, and everything that is not permitted between married persons.” The mind of a young girl is thus polluted and debauched before she approaches the confessional; ideas are put into her head and sins suggested of which she would have never dreamt; and when she approaches her confessor, what takes place? In the spirit of the “preparation” is she confessed, and questions are insinuated and asked to satisfy the conscience of the aged and sincere, or the vulgar curiosity of the prying, or the prurient imagination of the licentious priest (of which class I may say their name is Legion), and our penitent rises absolved and morally polluted. So much for the influence of confession on social decency and virtue; and if Englishwomen, as is most true, are distinguished above all others for modesty and purity, it is greatly to be attributed to the fact that impurity is not suggested to their minds through the medium of the confessional. I will take another view of the case, and not merely a hypothetical view, but one which I know to be justified by facts. Our fair penitent shall have her love passages and other peccadilloes which she would fain conceal even from her confessor; for though the old proverb says, “a fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind,” I have generally observed that a man is far from indulgent to those who practise the same sins with himself; and who knows but what his reverence might impose a heavy penitence, and place many an insuperable obstacle to the enjoyments which our penitent may have allowed herself? In such cases, then, there is going on within the confessional a kind of intellectual fencing—thrust and parry, thrust and parry. The one endeavours to extract every secret of the heart; the other attempts to conceal, and misrepresents or lies. This is a fact of daily, hourly occurrence; it cannot and may not be contradicted; but what matters it? ’Tis only a lie or two more added to the account; and then she is absolved and communicated and reconciled to the Church, goes forth to the world a renewed soul, clad in robes of virgin white. But weigh well the effects of this skirmishing of the confessional on her mind. She has lied to God, according to her

creed, and may she not lie to man? How can we ever expect to find in such a woman the truthfulness of a friend or the fidelity of a wife? The barriers of truth are broken down; henceforwards, any kind of fraud may enter. Such are the legitimate consequences of an impertinent and outrageous rite, which, however beautiful in theory, practically violates the conscious liberty of the human mind, and awakens within it rebellion, and leads to sin. There was a time when I would not have doubted the truth of "confessions;" facts have opened my eyes, as well as the scornful manner in which educated Italians commonly speak of the sacrament. "Do you really believe it, and for that reason too?" said a friend one day, to whom I had asserted something on the authority of the confessor: "that is no guarantee for the truth," said he, with a sneer. "Do you think that people always tell the truth, or the whole truth, in the confessional? Not they! They would be fools if they did." And, in fact, the approach of the season for confession is the signal for all kinds of subterfuges and preparations. There was lately a report that a mission was making the round of the country places in the neighbourhood of Naples, and, like some noxious, unwholesome vapour, gliding along the coast. The pestilential influence on the mind was immediately apparent; a general precipitancy and fluttering were observable, as though a hawk were hovering above; people were putting their houses in order—very cognizant of and severe on the sins of others—"thank God, they were not adulterers," though they might be drunkards—"that *they* were not blasphemers," though their lives might be a libel on truth. Thus they flattered themselves into the belief that they were well prepared to pass muster; whilst, to make all still safer, some sins were laid aside for a time, with the full intention of being resumed at a more convenient season. Subterfuge and deceit were the order of the day, and modes were devised by which the ghostly confessor might be kept in the dark. Oh! what a grand and edifying testimony it was to the value and influence of confession! When, too, these strange confessors come, I find they are highly popular, notwithstanding the fright which the announcement of their approach awakened. The whole population rush to them. Hoary sinners who have not confessed for years, and fair penitents laden with peccadilloes, crowd around these holy sentinels. Why? They do not know all the secrets of the parish bosom, and cannot propose, therefore, sly and inconvenient questions. Thus it happens that persons who never would have been absolved by their regular confessor, are polished off, take the communion, and are numbered with the saints. It may be, too, that many a scrupulous penitent prefers the strange confessor (and the Church has made the provision probably with this view) because they can confess with more openness and less reserve from the fact of their being unknown—that is to say, that whereas they concealed facts from their own confessor, they have no objection to make a clean bosom to the stranger. Take whichever view you like of this popular predilection for the stranger, we have another proof of the insufficiency and immoral tendency of confession. I might describe fifty other equally offensive and injurious aspects of confession as I have witnessed them, but pause, and dwell on those I have laid before you. Consider that such scenes are enacted and such struggles are going on in every city, every village, every family, every individual



mind, and then estimate the enormous amount of iniquity for which this sacrament must be made responsible.

I shall conclude this letter, which I fear will already have become tedious, by describing a scene I lately witnessed, amusing from its comic features. The Pope has lately instituted a "Guibileo,"—thus giving priests permission to absolve all sorts of sins, and effect a general whitewashing. Great, therefore, have been the laudations of Pio Nono amongst the superstitious multitude, as if the Most High had descended from the skies and granted an universal pardon. All classes and all ages have been invited to partake of the common bounty; and in the place where I was staying, one day was fixed upon for the "picciarelli" (youngsters). It is always pleasant to see children assembled together; and I went to indulge my fancy, and to see the sins of these young Adams forgiven. The church was comparatively empty, but behind the choir, which was semicircular, there ran a covered aisle, and here was the scene of bustle and of action. At first, I thought that all the children of the parish were out upon a "lark." Such running and struggling—such screams of delight, or of fun or of pain; wee infants toddling along, not under the weight of years or of sin, and young scapegraces beginning life with tweaking hair and pulling caps from such as had any. It was very evident, in spite of an occasional h-u-s-h! that confession to them was a very jolly kind of thing—a game of "prisoner's base," or "I spy," on a large scale. Well, to be honest, I entered thoroughly into the fun of the scene, and stood looking on delighted, until another hush! called my attention to a great arm-chair, in which was seated a ghostly confessor, leaning down to receive the confession of a child so young that he might be said to be just out of lisping and not into breeches. Looking round, I saw other chairs of a similar description, with priests similarly occupied; and, making the round, I had a nod from one, a smile from another, and a pinch of snuff from a third. As one young sinner was finished off, there was a general bustle amongst the expectants; and away they ran, scrambling and struggling and tumbling one over the other, in their eagerness to fill up the vacancy. But what on earth, said I, have these infants to confess? To solve my doubts, I asked a priest at what age they begin confession? "Oh," said he, "from two or three years." "And when do they take the communion?" "That depends on the development of the mind; from ten or eleven, and even earlier." "And what have these youngsters to confess? How do you examine them?" "We put slight questions and give them good advice. Such as for instance, we ask them if they respect their father and mother" (very good! but this principle of submission is the first that is inculcated, and in every relation), "or if they have stolen their 'merenda' or committed other small pilferings" (highly suggestive, I thought); "and then we finish by some good advice." Of course I bowed in acknowledgment of the information, and retired greatly edified; but as I looked around on the merry souls, my thoughts took even a more comic turn as I imagined the different kinds of penitence these little imps would be undergoing in a few hours. Could they be seen making up their accounts in one place, and Punch be present! Some would be standing on their heads, and others on their tails; some kneeling on their hands, and some inscribing crosses on the ground with their tongues; others muttering Pater-nosters with

the intelligence of my dog Flo; and others performing a variety of other antics. And why all this? As an expression of regret? Oh, no; because their priest has told them to do so! To them he is the locum tenens of Jesus Christ; and had he told them to do greater things, they would have done them.

*Naples.*

H. W.—.

## THE BLACKMORE PAPERS. No. III.

### CHEWNING BLACKMORE (*concluded*).

THE early Presbyterian Nonconformist ministers of England entertained very lofty notions, not merely of the inalienable nature of their office as ministers of the gospel, but also of the very close relation in which a pastor stood to his flock. It was often a relation for life. Those who thought that ministers were married to their ministry, did not generally imagine that they were married to a particular people; but they never approved of a separation on slight grounds, and declined to sanction it unless they could see visible tokens of God's providence leading to a change.

Mr. Chewning Blackmore appears to have been sorely tried at various periods of his life by the anxiety of other congregations to secure to themselves the services which had been attended at Worcester with so large a measure of success. Early in the year 1706-7, he was invited and strongly urged to remove to London, probably to take charge of the Independent congregation of Fetter Lane. Mr. Benoni Rowe, the pastor of this congregation, died March 30, 1706. The pulpit was not filled up till July 10, 1707, when the ordination of the noted Thomas Bradbury took place. We may suppose that the long delay was in part occasioned by the indecision of Mr. Chewning Blackmore. It is no objection to this hypothesis that the congregation was Independent, for the minister chosen, Mr. Bradbury, had been assistant minister at Newcastle to a Presbyterian congregation, and was thought of about the same time as a suitable minister for Cross Street, Manchester. Mr. Shower, the eminent Presbyterian minister of London, the friend and correspondent of Mr. Blackmore, appears to have been on very friendly terms with his Independent neighbours at Fetter Lane; for when the vacancy was filled up, he took the principal part in the ordination service of the new minister.\*

Mr. Blackmore appears to have consulted two of the most eminent country ministers respecting his invitation to London,—Matthew Henry, of Chester, and Francis Tallents, of Shrewsbury. Their replies, though interesting records of the opinions of their age respecting the ministerial office, could not materially aid him in coming to a conclusion.

*Rev. Francis Tallents to Rev. Chewning Blackmore.*

“Tuesday, Mar. 11, 1706-7.

“Dear Sir,—I hasten my answer by the first opportunity, though it is like to be but a poor one, though it come from a loving and impartial heart. The main thing in all these cases is an upright heart, sincerely and chiefly aiming

\* See Wilson's History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches, III. 451.



to serve Christ our Lord, and not ourselves; and in this only the Searcher of our hearts can judge, and the testimony of our conscience there is an unspeakable strength and comfort; and our God, I trust, will sweetly guide you in that good way. Your so full election to London without any knowledge or design of yours, to such a congregation, is very considerable and greatly to be regarded, as it hath always been, for it is of exceeding use many ways. Your usefulness where you are, and in the country about, is also very great; and how a supply can be made there, I know not; but you are the fittest judge of that, who know the persons and all the circumstances. As to outward motives, I think them not very considerable, as to salary, &c.; and as to the convenience of your dear children's education, the consideration of your health (which I hear is but indifferent) may weigh against it, since it is like to be worse at London than at Worcester. So, since outward concerns are not like to move you much, your difficulty is less in this matter; and God, I trust, on your seeking him in truth, will direct you in the way you should choose, and stablish and strengthen and be with you for good, whether you shall go or stay: when you can say, if you go, you go for God, and if you stay, you stay for God; and not as many, who for profit and credit and self ends dispose of themselves. If all things have not been so much to satisfaction as formerly, let not that discourage you; for so it usually proves in most places, sooner or later. And if you shall remove, be sure to seek out as fit a person as you can to supply your place, for the good of them and the whole countie; and I heartily desire your people may carry themselves in a godly manner in such a case, that Christ may delight to dwell amongst them. Though I write not this to advise your removing, for, as I have said, you only in your own heart, who best know all particulars, can by guidance of your Heavenly Father do that.

"I am, dear Sir, your humble servant and fellow-servant in our blessed  
Lord,  
FRA. TALLENTS.

"Consider where you are like to be most useful. My due respects and service to your dear consort. I received not your letter till Lord's-day morning."

Rev. Matthew Henry to Rev. Chewning Blackmore.

"Chester, March 15, 1706-7.

"Dear and honoured Sir,—None more willing than I, nor less able, to advise my friends and assist them. I know not what to say upon the strait you are in. I pray to God to direct you and make your way plain, who knows what is good for a man, for a minister, in this life. Integrity and uprightness will direct as well as preserve. I think you have the consideration to make the strait less *amazing*; that in itself, neither the one nor the other is sin. If you go, you have not sinned, nor if you stay; for whether you go or stay you are the Lord's, and sincerely intend to serve and glorify him. So that all the question is concerning the *majus bonum*; for if it be equal, *melior est conditio possidentis*. I have not been in my judgment so much against the removing of ministers as some are. If the principle be bad, that makes it evil, or the manner of doing it. Otherwise, 'tis oft expedient and sometimes necessary. I know no scripture against it. The marriage union I understand not. They who think it unlawful for a minister to remove to another congregation, would not condemn a member if he remove his habitation—suppose to London, and there sit under another minister; and the bond cannot be supposed stronger on the one side than on the other. I have discovered sometimes the aversion of people to their ministers removing, to be very much a point of honour; as also, that the consequences of a change have not been so bad as feared, God having the residue of the spirit. Diversity of gifts is to profit withall. It may reasonably be thought that London is a larger sphere of usefulness, and that you would there thrust in your sickle into a more plentiful harvest. And as iron sharpens iron, so do they there sharpen

the countenances one of another. And if you should yield to the importunity of your friends there, I believe it would be a great strengthening to their hands, and great service to the common interests of the gospel there. And I would hope that if another (suppose Mr. Porter, of Alcester) should be fully fixed before you leave, the people would be easy, and no sensible damage would follow. But, on the other hand, you will consider whether you can break through the difficulties of a remove; whether you can bear the reproach of removing merely for worldly advantage, and turn it off with the *murus athenicus* of a *nil consciri sibi*: but especially whether you can bear the affectionate sorrows of your friends, your children whom you have begotten in the gospel, who can by no means think of parting with you: whether it will not be an uneasiness to you in the reflection if it should prove that the congregation should be brought to decay by your leaving them? In the lives and characters of ministers generally, their adherence to a people is mentioned to their praise, and their removes excused. Better the inconveniences and discouragements I know than those I do not know, for wherever we go we must expect them. The city, indeed, deserves such men, and they it. But the country needs them, and can ill spare them. A moon in Worcestershire will be but a star, though of the first magnitude, in the constellation at London. Upon the whole matter, I know not what to advise. Had we a urim to consult, or durst we appeal to the lot, we might in such cases be easy. However, we know who hath said, *I will guide thee with mine eye*: with a hint of Providence, *guide with my spirit* in the heart. I shall endeavour according to my poor ability to pray to God to direct you.

"The second vol. of Exposition, as God enables me, I am going on with fair and softly. I propose it shall go to the end of Esther. 'Tis come to 1 Sam. vii. 'Twill be larger than the first, for 'tis more, and not so much that can be lightly passed over, till Chronicles, as was in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. But I shall be mindful of your memorandum to contract. I thank you for the interest you afford me in your prayers, which I beg the continuance of, especially that I may be enabled to proceed in a constant, humble, believing dependance upon the assistance and direction of the blessed Spirit; for I am nothing—nothing. I commend you to God and to the word of his grace, and rest your affectionate brother and servant,

MAT. HENRY."

Mr. Blackmore's neighbours and brethren in the ministry were by no means indifferent as to his decision. The following letter and memorial are pleasing proofs of the harmony that reigned amongst the Presbyterian ministers of Worcestershire a century and a half ago.

*Rev. George Flower\* to Rev. Chewning Blackmore.*

"March 6, 1706.

"Dear Sir,—I have been not a little perplexed and concerned ever since I heard of your invitation to London. The fears of losing my dear friend Mr. Warren† were scarce dissipated, when new ones are raised from another quar-

\* Of Mr. Flower, the chaplain at Prestwood, and the pastor of the Presbyterian congregation at Stourbridge, mention has already been made (C. R. VIII. p. 5). He was a native of Burton-upon-Trent, and studied at Sheriff-Hales, under Mr. Woodhouse. In 1696, he succeeded Mr. Warren, mentioned in this letter, afterwards of Coventry, as domestic chaplain to Mr. Foley. In 1715, the interior of his meeting-house was sacked by a High-Church mob. He died aged 59 years, during thirty-five of which he had sustained the pastoral relation, Jan. 1, 1733, and was buried at Burton-upon-Trent. In Dr. Latham's funeral sermon for Mr. Bradshaw, he mentions Mr. Flower as "one in whom the gentleman, the Christian and the scholar, were gracefully united." See Toulmin's *Life of Bourn*, pp. 275, 276.

† Rev. John Warren, minister for fifty years at Coventry. He died in 1742, aged 79.



ter which are equally afflicting and disconsolate. I hope, therefore, good Sir, you will not be offended at me for delivering my thoughts and expostulating with you about this matter. Let me be an advocate for the church of God, and the interest of religion in general, in the town and country adjacent to you, which are like to be great sufferers in the removal. Your great interest, influence, labours, example, &c., are very extensive and successful for the support and encouragement of God's cause. The very thought of your recess from Worcestershire give all your friends hereabout a very melancholy prospect. You have not so much as one suffrage among all that I can converse with, but rather an universal declaration of their dislike. And I have a particular command from my good lady\* (who sends her special service to you), to signify her great and earnest desire that you would not comply with their invitation. Let me be a solicitor likewise for my Worcester friends. Will you be deaf to all their humble and importunate remonstrances? I know they have sad thoughts of heart about this affair, and cannot but forebode and apprehend ill consequences of your removal. You are got deep in their affections, and I believe God has made your labours very successful among them for the spreading and maintaining of real vital religion. How, then, will their hearts be discouraged and grieved if you should leave them! \* \* \*

"Pray, Sir, give humble service to Mrs. Blackmore, Mr. Hand, &c. Let me entreat a share in your prayers and affection, and your acceptance of sincere respects and service from, dear Sir, your affectionate though unworthy brother and fellow-labourer in the gospel of Christ,

GEO. FLOWER."

*To the Rev. Chewning Blackmore.*

"Dear and honoured Brother,—We have been considering together the invitation to London, and what you have proposed to some of us who have spoken with you both for and against your removal; we hope you'll give us leave to represent our thoughts of the whole. We own if the choice was unanimous, it is the more inviting, and worldly advantages are much greater there for ministers than in the country; and they may not meet with so much opposition and people of contrary opinions, and may have greater friends to stand by them in such cases. We know also the field will be much larger to work in; ministers there may be very desirous of your company, and you may have better opportunities for the well-educating of your children, and we fear the people at Worcester have not been so encouraging as they ought to be. Yet, notwithstanding all this, we judge your removal may have greater inconveniences attending it than these advantages can answer. We cannot think you can be so much desired by a people that know you not at London, as we are sure you are at Worcester. If the worldly advantages are less where you are, yet the circumstances, we hope, are not strait, and the blessing of God can enrich them as well as it hath done you. Because of the difficulties we meet with from opposers, we can by no means be reconciled to let you go. Your knowledge of the country and circumstances make you in many public respects the most capable person of encouraging, advising, and many ways assisting. Should the most worthy man succeed you, he cannot fill the place for many years, because of this ignorance of the country and circumstances. That place will be much easier to be filled than yours. How will adversaries triumph and reproach; the people languish and divisions break forth among them; the assistant mourn, the brethren about lament, and the country round be greatly distressed, who are oft speaking to us with great concern! We therefore humbly request you would consider it so as to resolve you will continue among us. We would not meddle in this matter, but that the public

---

\* The lady of Prestwood. Amongst the letters is a very affectionate and urgent one, to the same purport as Mr. Flower's, signed Eliza Foley,—perhaps a sister of the master of Prestwood, as she mentions her brother and sister Foley being at that time in London.

welfare and loss of the country depends upon it. Now the fathers in the ministry are gone, you are in their stead to most of us hereabouts, and do not desert us, dear Sir. May we in anything be capable of serving you or your interest, we shall rejoice to do it, if you will stay with us. We know you are more able to give advice yourself than we to instruct you, but yet we could not but shew our thoughts. May God direct and prosper you, is the prayer of your unworthy brethren and servants,

JOHN SPILSBURY (*Kidderminster*).

EDWD. OSLAND (*Bewdley*).

JAMES THOMPSON (*Bromsgrove*).

GEO. FLOWER (*Stourbridge*).

RI. PRUTHERO.

JAMES SPILSBURY.

“Kidderminster, March 24, 1706-7.”

The proofs of affectionate regard contained in these letters probably had some influence in deciding Mr. Blackmore not to quit a scene of proved usefulness to try the experiment of a metropolitan pulpit.

In 1712, when Matthew Henry left Chester for Hackney, the congregation assembling in Crook's Lane invited Mr. Blackmore to be their pastor. For nearly a year they were kept in a state of uncertainty as to his decision, and in the end his resolution to remain at Worcester appears to have given no small disappointment to the Chester congregation, and the fact is recorded in their chapel-book, not without a faint expression of their displeasure.

Mr. Blackmore does not appear to have committed anything to the press. But a judgment respecting his style of preaching may be formed from portions of a funeral sermon which he preached in 1726, at Kidderminster, on the occasion of the death of Rev. John Spilsbury. Portions of this sermon are inscribed in the chapel-book at Kidderminster, but the extracts which follow are taken from the *Congregational Magazine*, New Series, V. 571—573. The writer states that the sermon is founded on Acts xx. 38, and further says, that it will richly repay perusal by the fine vein of piety that runs through it, the weighty sentiments with which it is charged, and the nervous and forcible style peculiar to that age in which they were delivered.

“If I should enter on the character of the Rev. John Spilsbury, how many things might I say of this beloved brother! Something I must say. He feared God greatly in his youth. Few parents had such a child, an only child. They had the comfort of many in him, who inherited the graces both of his father and mother (great blessings to their generation and to the town and country where they long lived very useful, and died comfortably in a good old age and full of days). He chose the ways of God betimes, and chose the way of Nonconformity out of judgment and conscience, was a great credit to it and promoter of it. The disposal of his children, as well as the course of his own life, shewed his heart therein. He was a lover of good men; not given to bigotry, but charity; not given to filthy lucre, but given to hospitality; had always an open heart, house, hand and purse. He had a great genius, and was very judicious, the most qualified person I have known, who had no more public education. He appeared as if he had been under all the advantages of the most large, expensive, liberal and open education. God blessed him from his youth with considerable health, wealth, comeliness and estate, guided his mind and directed him to settle with a most meet help and companion of his life and labours.\* \* \* \* He was fixed among you in this

\* The maiden name of Mrs. Spilsbury was Bridges. She survived her hus-



place in his younger years, here to ripen for service; young in years, old in grace. I count it one of the best things I ever had a hand in, the share I had in settling him first with you. A most prudent disposer of his family and private affairs, he was also thought worthy of many public trusts, and faithful in them all. A peace-maker, a peace-keeper; a ready, faithful, compassionate friend, nearer than a brother; so friendly that he seemed to over-value some of his friends—I think so for my own part—above what was deserved. \* \* \* In prayers frequent, fervent and most suitably adapted to your particular cases and occasions, and to the public also. Here's a loss to the public. A practical, solid, grave, judicious preacher, expositor and catechist; in all these cases laying out himself; vigilant, indefatigable, (I must say, I think) over-working himself from first to last, whereby he broke a brave constitution, and was brought under many pains and weaknesses and infirmities. God would have him to be a pattern of patience to you, as well as a light among you. In all his sufferings I admired him as much as I did in his labours. He had many seals to his ministry, many that are fallen asleep, and some that are present. \* \* \* His natural and acquired endowments all concurred to render him generally useful and acceptable in town and country. These counties, nay, many in London, England and Wales, do and will lament this great, this good man's death. \* \* \* How lovely was he in his person, mien and appearance!

*Sic oculus, sic ille manus, sic ora ferebat.*

“Lovely in his temper was he not? As it is said of the Roman Emperor, *Deliciæ humani generis?* Lovely in his life. You know how usefully and exemplarily he lived among you. And lovely in his death, not regretting its approaches; but resigned, yea well pleased with the will of God. ‘The sooner the better,’ said he once and again. He was lovely, too, after his death, above most. His natural loveliness returned to his face and countenance. A lovely corpse before he was laid in the grave, how lovely will his body be when it shall arise, shake off the dust, and put on its new garments and robes of immortality, which shall never be worn out! \* \* \* As he lay in his coffin he looked more like one asleep than dead, with loveliness and liveliness in his countenance, betokening the bitterness of death was past, and that he lay waiting for, and was a faint emblem of, the resurrection. \* \* \* You his beloved flock, let me leave with you that word, Heb. xii. 7, ‘Remember him that has had the rule over you.’ Follow his faith, and be encouraged by the end of his conversation. Keep together in love. \* \* \* Believe what he taught you, avoid what he warned you of, try yourselves as he directed you, and be comforted with the consolations he brought you. Long have you enjoyed him, I think about thirty-three years; about as long as the time our Lord Jesus lived upon the earth. You have had three of God’s worthies, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Spilsbury, and these three, their ministry hath been stretched out above 70 years.\* What will be expected from you both

---

band more than thirty years, although at the time of his death Mr. Blackmore spoke of her as “like shortly to overtake” him. Her faculties (except her hearing) continued unimpaired to the advanced age of 96. Rev. B. Fawcett, in preaching her funeral sermon, stated that she was found in the ways of righteousness for at least fourscore years; she was a communicant in the chapel at Kidderminster not less than sixty-six years; she survived her husband thirty years; was mother-in-law to the succeeding pastor, whom she survived seventeen years; but she left behind her a son, two sons-in-law and a grandson, all engaged in the ministry; and that the ordination of her grandson was solemnized at Kidderminster just before her last illness.

\* In fact, nearly eighty years. Baxter spent sixteen years of his ministry in Kidderminster, two before and fourteen after the civil war. Mr. Baldwin, when ejected from Chaddesly, 1662, settled at Kidderminster, and, with some interruptions from persecution, remained there till his death in 1693. Rev. John

by God and man! Be ye holy in all manner of conversation, and give diligence, that you may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless."

Mr. Blackmore shewed his deep interest in the ministry of the Protestant Dissenters by educating for it two sons, Francis and Edward Chewning. A portion of their school education seems to have been received at Leicester, and a further portion at Hertford. Their residence at the latter place brought their father into correspondence with Dr. John Guyse,\* the eminent Independent minister, for twenty-seven years, at Hertford, and then for thirty-four years at New Broad Street, London.

*Dr. John Guyse to Rev. Chewning Blackmore.*

"Hertford, July 20, 1719.

"Rev. Sir,—I received the favour of yours by the young gentlemen your sons, and had troubled you with an earlier answer, had I not thought it best to defer it till things were so far settled as to enable us to form a probable judgment about them.

"Mr. Lobb is settled in one of the most pleasant, safe and convenient houses in our town for his business, and he seems to be more than ordinarily furnished with dispositions and abilities to make him useful in it. His moral character stands very clean, and as far as I have been capable of observing, such a frank and undisguised simplicity seems to run through his conduct, that I can see no reason to doubt his being a very honest man. The modesty and sincerity which discover themselves in all his pretensions to experimental religion are likewise good grounds of hope that he has received the grace of God in truth. His methods of instructing his scholars, both in literature and religion, far exceed all I have ever been before acquainted with, and approve themselves to all good judges in these parts who are acquainted with them. All his scholars, as far as I hear, love and respect him and speak honourably of him. Their studies are, as much as can be expected, their delight. *Omne tulit punctum, qui miscuit utile dulci*. This point Mr. Lobb happily pursues. He endeavours to make them understand what they are about, to give them uncommon assistances in the most toilsome parts of their work, to make them thirsty for learning and ambitious to excel each other in it. These are the principal engines by which he works up their minds to diligence. The scheme he has formed, and which I hope he will see well executed, for the economy of his school and family appears to me to be judiciously adjusted in well-proportioned intermixtures of religion, business and diversions. The order of things is well methodized, and all the parts of every day are laid out for their respective uses, so that every one always knows what he is to do. Upon the whole, as far as I can hitherto judge by conversation with him, inquiries about

---

Spilsbury, 1693—1727. The subsequent ministers were Rev. Matthew Bradshaw, 1727—1745; Rev. Benjamin Fawcett, 1745—1780. After Mr. Fawcett's death, a division of the congregation took place. The subsequent ministers of the old chapel have been Independents,—Messrs. Barrett, Steill, Helmore, Freeman and Ross. The line of Presbyterian ministers was continued in the new meeting-house through Rev. Robert Gentleman, Mr. Fry, Mr. Taylor, and Rev. M. Gibson, the present minister, who was ordained March 18, 1842.

\* Dr. Guyse was born at Hertford, 1680; removed to London, 1727; and died there, 1761, aged eighty years. An affecting incident in his ministry is recorded by Mr. Toplady. He was suddenly deprived of his eyesight in the pulpit, while engaged in the prayer before sermon. He continued the service without any interruption, and, although previously accustomed to read his sermons, preached without the aid of his notes a very impressive discourse. As he was led out of the meeting-house, he was consoled by an aged gentlewoman, one of his accustomed hearers, by the assurance that she had never heard him preach so powerfully as on that trying occasion.



him, and observation of his management, I really think the parents are very happy whose children are under his care. I have an only son,\* my only child, about fourteen years old. It has been his unhappiness to have three or four masters already, and when Mr. Lobb came to Hertford, he had been above a year at a good boarding-school ten miles from home, where I designed he should have finished his grammar learning. But I thought I should still much better consult his education by putting him to Mr. Lobb, and therefore have fixed him in *his house*. My son is in the same class with yours. I am much better satisfied now than ever I was before.

"Mrs. Lobb seems to be a serious, good-tempered woman, and though she is young she applies to business, and I hope will make a tender, careful and prudent manager. She is in communion with us, having been so before with Mr. Green at Leicester (?). And I believe after some time her husband will be in communion with us too.

"The young gentlemen your sons are both very well and send their duty. As far as I find, they go on commendably, and are very easy, except that they are not fully reconciled to the restraints their master thinks necessary to lay on all the scholars from going out of their bounds without his or their mistress's special leave. I presume they had more liberty at Leicester, the family there not having formed into the order of a boarding-school. This at present makes them a little disrelish a restraint they were not used to before, as themselves have suggested to my son. But I don't doubt but a little time will work up their minds to a calm acquiescence at least in what is so necessary in itself and so useful to themselves. All regular schools that I have heard of, are subject to such laws, and however the children may at first dislike them, I believe the most prudent of their parents would more dislike a repeal of them. The young masters don't know that I have heard anything of their uneasiness (which I hope is not much) on this head, nor have I thought fit to speak to them, or Mr. Lobb, or any other person, about it; nor should I have troubled you, Sir, with it, had you not encouraged, I had almost said enjoined, me to concern myself in what I think for your advantage. You will pardon this freedom, and improve this hint in such a manner as your wisdom shall direct. Only I beg your sons may not so much as guess that I have suggested anything that looks like accusing them, lest they should misconstrue my good and faithful intentions in it. They are indeed a couple of very promising youths. I hear of no complaints of them, nor of anything irregular in their behaviour. I look upon them with pleasure, as they are the hopeful sons of a gentleman of your worthy character, and for your sake, as well as theirs, I shall find a peculiar satisfaction in it, if God shall make me any way serviceable to them.

"I have a catechetical lecture every other Wednesday, which is as often as the weak state of my health will admit of. I have talked with Mr. Lobb about the young gentlemen's being my catechumens. He heartily approves of it, and desires they all may be so. I have likewise mentioned it to your sons, who were present last lecture to see my method, and they discover good inclination to list into that service. The Lord make it of saving advantage to them for his glory and for their present and eternal comfort!

"I thank you, Sir, for the favourable opinion you have of me, and for the confidence you are pleased to place in me. I am indeed unworthy of both; but by the grace of God it shall be my care to do what I can to answer your expectations from me. I shall think it an honour to have a share in your friendship and acquaintance, and can't but promise myself the pleasure of

---

\* The only child of Dr. Guyse was the Rev. William Guyse, for many years his father's assistant in London, also, in his turn, morning lecturer at Monkwell Street and evening lecturer at White's Row, Spitalfields. He was a man of great modesty. He died before his father, in 1759, aged fifty-four years. See Wilson's Dissenting Churches, II. 242, 243.

your company ere long at Hertford, since you have already sent two dear and valuable pledges of it. In the mean time I heartily wish you all desirable assistance and success in your holy ministrations, and beg your prayers for the same in mine.

"I am, with great respect, Sir, your affectionate brother and humble servant,  
JOHN GUYSE."

*Rev. Thomas Perrot,\* of Carmarthen, to Rev. Chewning Blackmore.*

"Bristol, Sept. 23, 1726.

"Rev. Sir,—Having promised to send you an account of my method in administering the Lord's Supper, I can only say that I do as near as I can follow the pattern given us by our Saviour, as it is recorded in Matthew xxvi. and other places in the N. T. I do usually begin with a short prayer. Then I insist upon some subject that I think pertinent to the occasion, in order to prepare our minds for the ordinance. And because it is in commemoration of Christ's death, I always take notice of his manifold sufferings, the causes and the fruits of them, and often insist upon the graces that are to be exercised at this sacrament, and the end and use of it, as set forth in Assembly's Longer and Shorter Catechism; and pray before the breaking of the bread, and also before the delivering of the cup, because this seems to me most agreeable to the words of the institution, and is generally practised in Wales. After the distribution of the bread and wine, I exhort to some of those duties that we are in this ordinance called to, and endeavour to shew that our covenant is renewed in it, and that we are brought under new obligations to duty, and that we ought to grow in grace, because this sacrament is for our spiritual nourishment, &c. In this part of the work, as well as in the beginning, I take the liberty to insist upon various subjects at different times. My meaning is, that I do not always insist on the same subject. After this exhortation, we sing a psalm and conclude with prayer. We have always a day of preparation for the Lord's Supper before it is administered.

"Sir, since I left Worcester, I called at divers places, and in some of them I have been long detained before I came to this city. Mr. Noble† is so weak, that it is generally thought he cannot live but a few days. I have had some small success here in the business I am about. If you have any money for me, you may direct it to be left with Mr. William Griffith, at the Bird-in-Hand, in the Old Market, Bristol. I return you many thanks for my kind entertainment at your house, and for all favours conferred on your very much obliged, humble servant,

THO. PERROT."

---

\* Thomas Perrot, a native of Lanibry, of Carmarthenshire (but described in the Life of Henry as of Newmarket, in Flintshire), was educated first by Mr. Griffith, of Abergavenny, and then at the academy of Mr. James Owen, at Shrewsbury. He was ordained by the Cheshire Classis at Knutsford in 1706, by Matthew Henry, Mr. Angier, of Dukinfield, and many other ministers. His thesis was, "An sacra scriptura sit sola regula fidei et morum?" Mr. Henry prayed and gave the exhortation on the occasion. Mr. Perrot settled at Bromborough, in Cheshire, and continued there till 1718 or 1719, when he removed to Carmarthen to preside over the academy for the education of Dissenting ministers. He was a man noted for his meekness and goodness of heart. His academy was in great repute. He had in fifteen years about a hundred and fifty pupils, amongst whom were Mr. Herbert, Mr. F. Boulton and Mr. Eben. Key. Mr. Perrot died about 1734, and was succeeded as a tutor by Mr. Vavasor Griffiths, who, perceiving the ill consequences that had sometimes resulted from his predecessor's mildness, fell into the contrary fault of excessive and ascetic severity. These particulars are gathered from the minutes of the Cheshire Classis, and Jos. Thompson's Account (MS.) of Dissenting Academies. At the time of writing the letter to Mr. Blackmore given above, Mr. Perrot would seem to have been making a collection amongst the churches for some public object.

† Mr. Noble had been a pupil of Mr. Frankland's. He was probably a minister of the Tucker-Street congregation in Bristol.



In April, 1734, Chewning Blackmore lost, after an union of forty years, his beloved wife. She had borne him eight children, of whom three sons and three daughters survived both parents. Her funeral sermon was preached at Worcester, May 5, 1734, by Rev. Josiah Rogerson, of Derby. Very full notes of this sermon are preserved; and they confirm the opinion maintained by the compilers of the "Historic Proofs" prepared for use in the Hewley suit, that Mr. Rogerson was somewhat heterodox in his views.\* He and his brother Richard had been pupils of Mr. Jollie, at Attercliffe, and both entered on the ministry about 1707.

Of the heterodoxy of the sons of Chewning Blackmore, there is little or no doubt; and his own habitual abstinence from controverted points in the pulpit, taken in connection with the pregnant fact of his inviting into his pulpit on so memorable an occasion as the death of his wife a minister of known latitudinarian views, raises the presumption that before the close of his life the orthodoxy of his early years was at least considerably modified. In addition to other proofs of a heterodox bias, may be mentioned Chewning Blackmore's selection of a tutor and a theological academy for his eldest son. Dr. Latham, of Findern, was considered by many of his contemporaries as a heterodox teacher, and not without reason, if we may judge of the tutor's opinions by those of his pupils. To mention no other names at present, those of Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, and Rev. William Turner, of Wakefield, will illustrate our meaning. Of Dr. Latham more will be said in the next chapter, relating to Francis Blackmore. The connection between Chewning Blackmore and Mr. Stokes, his assistant, rather favours the supposition that at the close of his life the former had in some degree receded from the orthodoxy in which he had been educated. The friendly mention of Mr. Stokes in Mr. Blackmore's directions to his executors, shews that personal regard cemented the official union of the minister of the Angel-Street congregation and his assistant. The opinion of the late Dr. Jonathan Stokes, of Chesterfield, grandson of Mr. Stokes, of Worcester, has already been stated (C. R. for January, p. 12, note). Dr. Stokes supposes that his grandfather continued at Worcester as assistant minister both under Mr. Spilsbury and Mr. Francis Blackmore. About 1746, deficiencies arose, and he left the congregation and the city.

Until the death of his wife, he appears to have enjoyed an eminently prosperous and happy life. Excepting occasional and rare attacks of an acute disease, his health had been prevailingly good until he had passed the limits of threescore years and ten. The friend who preached his funeral sermon (MS.) says of him, "He had lived for a great many years, happily and usefully. God gave him religious wisdom, and he withheld no good thing else from him; for he had riches, friends,

---

\* In 1737, there was published by Rev. S. Bourn a Large Catechism, containing the system of Christianity, in which the doctrine of the Trinity has no place. To this book Mr. Rogerson, Mr. Mottershead, of Manchester, and four other English Presbyterian ministers, prefixed a recommendatory attestation. Mr. Jos. Rogerson also distinguished himself as an assertor, about the same period, of the rights of conscience, in the controversy which arose on the exclusion from communion, by Rev. James Sloss, of Mr. Joseph Rawson, of Nottingham, on account of his supposed heresy respecting the Trinity. See Mon. Rep., VI. 587.

honour, health (excepting some few fits of the gravel and stone). But all that is human must decay, and its glory cease. His much thinking proved very prejudicial to him at last; and though wisdom exceedeth folly, as much as light excelleth darkness, yet he found knowledge and hard studying to be a sore travail; for that and his constant preaching had so broke and worn out his spirits, that for the last three years of his life he endured a grievous failure of them." He felt it a sore trial of faith and patience, that during his decline he was unable to continue the offices of the pulpit. He suffered more from a general decay and consequent feebleness, than from acute pain. About the middle of July, 1737, he was attacked violently by stone, the student's disorder. He endured his sufferings with fortitude: they lasted about a fortnight, and incapacitated him for taking nourishment or conversing with his grieving family and friends. On the second of August he seemed to collect his few remains of strength, as if resolved to endure firmly whatever further sufferings were appointed to him. He had few spiritual anxieties. In one of his latest conversations, he expressed his readiness to die and to render his account to his Maker, saying (as Archbishop Tillotson had said in similar circumstances), the work of salvation was not then to be secured, and that he had nothing then to do but to wait for the will of Heaven. But the hour of his dismissal was come. On the day mentioned he fell into a tranquil slumber, whence he passed out of his earthly life without a struggle or a groan. His age was seventy-four years and seven months. His remains were deposited in St. Andrew's church, in which, in the course of the following year, a monument was erected to his memory, at the cost of his youngest son, Edward Chewning, with this just inscription, from the pen of Dr. John Ward, F. R. S., Professor of Rhetoric, and author of the "Lives of the Professors" of Gresham College:

QUOD MORTALE FUIT  
 INSIGNIS DUM VIXIT THEOLOGI CHEWNINGI BLACKMORE  
 PROPE HUNC LOCUM JACET DEPOSITUM  
 PATREM HABUIT GULIELMUM BLACKMORE, A.M.  
 D. PETRI IN VICO CORNHILL LONDINI OLIM RECTOREM  
 BONARUM ARTIUM SEMINA PRIMA ETATE CITO ARRIPUIT  
 QUÆ DEINCEPS CULTU DILIGENTI TAM IN PATRIA  
 QUAM APUD EXTEROS MAGNA CEFERUNT INCREMENTA  
 DONEC AD MATURITATEM FELICITER PERVENERUNT  
 IIS AUTEM STUDIIS PRÆCIPUE SE ADDIXIT  
 QUÆ AD SACRUM SUUM MUNUS ADJUMENTO ESSE POSSENT  
 QUOD PER QUINQUAGINTA FERE ANNOS IN HAC URBE  
 MAGNA OMNIUM APPROBATIONE FIDELITER PRÆSTITIT  
 PIETATE MODESTIA MORUMQUE PROBITATE  
 BENIGNITATE IN PAUPERES IN OMNES BENEVOLENTIA  
 CHRISTIANAM QUAM DOCUIT RELIGIONEM PULCHRE EXORNANS  
 ANNO MDCXCIV. IN MATRIMONIUM DUXIT  
 ABIGAIL EDVARDI HIGGINS URBIS HUIUS GENEROSI FILIAM  
 EX QUA CUM QUINQUE FILIOS AC TRES FILIAS SUSCEPERAT  
 DULCI ILLIUS CONSORTIO XI. CAL. MAII A. MDCGXXXIV. ORBATUS  
 IPSE TANDEM STUDIIS ET LABORIBUS FRACTUS  
 ANIMAM PLACIDE DEO REDDIDIT IV. NON AUG. A.D. MDCCXXXVII.  
 ETATIS SUE LXXV.  
 SEX LIBEROS SUPERSTITES SIBI RELINQUENS  
 QUORUM MINIMUS NATU EDVARDUS CHEWNINGUS  
 HOC MONUMENTUM PATRI OPTIMO MÆRENENS POSUIT  
 ANNO MDCCXXXVIII.



Chewning Blackmore's will, dated May 9, 1734, shortly after the funeral of his wife, was executed in the presence of John Stokes, Samuel Morris and Russell Laughler. It directed that his funeral should be by daylight, and the expenses very moderate; and ordered the payment of small sums to his sons John and Francis, who were previously provided for, and to the children of Francis. The residue of the estate (which proved to be of the value of £8541. 15s.) was divided in four equal shares among his three daughters and Edward Chewning, his youngest son. His books were chiefly left to his sons Francis and Edward. He left copious directions to his executors and children respecting legacies to nephews and nieces. He directed £40 to be given to the poor of the congregation; £50 to be put to interest, to be given yearly to the pastor of the Worcester congregation, enabling him to preach two sermons—one on the 15th of July (the birthday of his father, Rev. William Blackmore), the other on the 1st day of January—directing his discourses particularly to young persons, on some text of scripture against the sin of delay in opening the excellency and grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. He also gave £60, the interest of which was to be expended in the purchase of Bibles to be given in and about Worcester. To the poor of the tything of Whiston and of St. Andrew's parish, he left £1. 10s. To the Rev. John Stokes and his wife, he left £5. He also divided various articles of plate and jewelry amongst his children.

---

#### THE DAY OF DOOM. A VISION.

And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God.—Rev. xx. 12.

Thousand thousands ministered unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him. The judgment was set, and the books were opened. Dan. vii. 10.

I STARTED up as from the deep slumber of the tomb. The thick darkness of night was around me; there was silence; and I was alone, as in the valley of Death.

Then a vision passed before me, and I saw things which it is hardly given to man to utter.

Darkness, and tempest, and lightning, and thunder, and earthquake, and the distant sound of tumult, and the mingled voices of a multitude, and all nature groaning in trouble or in fear, and the solid world shaken to its deep foundations. And then a voice—a blast, as from an archangel's trumpet—rends the sky; and after a brief interval of silence, again that terrific peal, echoing through the wide dark vault of heaven: and from afar a lurid light, as from some distant fire or some expiring sun, casts its red beams abroad, and illuminates the darkness with a solemn and awful glare. The earth heaves and trembles, and its surface is strewn with ruins. Its bosom opens, and dim forms, by hundreds, by thousands, by tens of thousands, by myriads, countless myriads, rise in shadowy succession from its dark recesses. The graves give up their dead,—the earth yields her sleeping children. Old and young, men and maidens, little children, and infants still sleeping on their mothers' arm, all rise and throng together, or move onwards in one direction towards that awful light and that ter-

rific sound. And still the blast of the trumpet calls, and wakens heaven and earth, and the deep places of the sea, and stirs the lowest depths of hell beneath; and the red lightning flashes through the void; and all things tremble and quake exceedingly, and yet seem not to know why.—What is this? What voice is calling? What fires are burning? What sun is extinguished? What day of terror is at hand?

The startled sleepers seem hardly to have thrown off the weight of their slumbers. They stumble along as if not yet awake, or as if bewildered by that lurid light, or as if lost in wonder at what these things may mean: yet they move onwards as by some impulse not their own, or as if drawn along unconsciously towards the sound of that trumpet blast. But some there be who are more awake than the multitude they move among. I see them gathering their robes around them, and lifting their eyes to heaven, and smiling with a smile of trust that shines through their tears, and speaks of peace even among the awfulness and the terrors that are brooding and flashing round them. They look as if their lamps were trimmed and their loins girded, and they themselves ready for the coming of their Lord. The darkness is less dark around them, and they move onwards as if along a path they did not fear to tread. And I hear some of these murmuring to themselves, as if speaking peace and strength to their inner spirit, and as if they were recalling the sure promises of Him in whom they had trusted—in whose way they had desired to walk—by whose hand they had been supported—by whose chastisements they had been corrected—by whose love they had been purified—and by whose mercy they this day hoped to enter into his rest. And I see that their souls are lifted heavenwards even now; and that they are seeking his face, and imploring his presence, and walking onward in trustful communion with his Spirit.

But all, alas! are not like these. Amid the shadowy throng I see some halting in their course, and standing still, weeping and wailing and groaning in the terror of their hearts, and calling on the rocks to fall upon them, and on the hills to cover them. These are indeed terrible to look upon. Their aspect is the aspect of despair; they look around, but there is no refuge; they look upward into the dark sky, but no star of hope is shining down upon them from above. Amid the half-illuminated darkness, an atmosphere of deeper gloom enshrouds them; and I hear voices of human woe and fear mingling with the sounds of nature's dissolution and the call of approaching judgment. Ah, whither shall they fly? Even death lies behind now, and the cold grave, the last refuge of human misery, has cast them forth from its dark hiding-places, and has closed its gates against them. But, hark! again the trumpet peals through the sky, and seems to call, "Come! come!"—and on they start again towards that terrible judgment-field whither all the generations of men are quickly gathering.

Onwards, onwards flows that mighty tide of resurrection. All the children of the earth! all the generations of mankind! Darkness closes in their rear, and in their front is that awful light towards which the summons calls them. And now it is before them—that scene of judgment, the gathering in of the harvest of the world! But what human tongue can tell what no human eye has seen, and what human



language was not made to utter? All the generations of men! Such an assembly as was never gathered together on the peopled surface of this busy world are there brought as one mighty congregation to meet their Lord and Judge among the clouds of heaven. And what a scene is before them and around them!—a scene, of which, vast as its extent, yet each one there forms an individual and appreciable atom! Clouds upon shining clouds;—mountains of clouds rising high above into the blue heavens, and filling up or veiling the dark gulfs below, and stretching far away on either side into the vast regions of unpeopled space;—hues, of which the most gorgeous sunsets of our Western world are but a feeble type, tinging those clouds with their glory, and diffusing over the scene a rich, soft, yet searching light, which illuminates but does not dazzle, and yet shines with so piercing a radiance that every individual of those countless myriads stands in the full light of its beams, and feels that he is visible to the eye of angels and of men, and that the record of his mortal life is there revealed to the universal gaze. His sins, his deeds of darkness, his secret guilt, his hidden thoughts, his real motives, his silent schemings, stand all disinterred and unveiled around him:—his whole moral man is there, plain as his bodily presence, and he is seen as even *he* never saw himself before. How many shrink with horror at the view! They care not now who sees them; they see themselves, and they start as they look upon their likeness. A new consciousness, a new knowledge, flashes on their senses: they forget all else; they feel no shame at the detection of their sins by their fellow-sinners; they shrink not from the gaze of the universe; they close their eyes upon the glory, and the terror, and the multitude; they are alone with their conscience and their God; “and amid the innumerable millions that surround them, they mourn and weep apart.”

To and fro sways that living sea, as fear, shame, remorse, or as hope and love—love not even now forgotten—move and agitate its restless waves. Chaos is waiting for Creation!

And now look up,—ye who have hope in your eye, and trust and faith sealed upon your hearts,—look up to yonder clouds, and see what and who are peopling those radiant hills of light. Forms such as never met our mortal eye; beings such as dwell not on terrestrial worlds; whose home is near the throne of the Most High, who see His face, and serve Him day and night in His temple; angels and arch-angels, and wings of seraphic spirits, waving in the light, and moving to and fro amid the shining hosts that stand in bright array, and in numbers like the stars of heaven, on the right hand and on the left. And in the midst, enthroned in light and clothed with the glory of his Father, sits one like the Son of Man, the Redeemer of his people, the Saviour of the world, the Lamb of God, but now the Judge of men. Of all the thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, who are there assembled, he alone is seated, and angels and men stand and bow before him. Ah! can this be he who became flesh and dwelt among us? Is this he who was reviled and rejected and slain by those miserable creatures who now stand trembling and howling before his presence? Is this he who hung upon the cross, and tasted the agony of mortal death, and was laid in an earthly sepulchre? Look upon that great being: let all the powers within you rise

to gaze thereon and to receive the impress of the vision. The calmness, the majesty, the power, the love, yet the terrors, of heaven surround him, and beam forth from the brightness of his countenance. Think what it must be to hear a blessing or a curse from those heavenly lips! Would not heaven itself be in the one? Could the darkness of hell be deeper misery and damnation than the other?

Hark, now! Again that trumpet calls. It peals forth its final blast. The sound fills all space, and dies away among the distant solitudes of the universe. *It is begun.* The dead are here: not one of them is lost. From the deep and from the mountain cave, from the desert and the peopled city, from the beginning of time till the blast proclaiming that time should be no more,—all are here; small and great, *all are here*: the judgment is set and the books are opened.

And now, expectation deepens into silence; the murmurs and wailings of the multitude are hushed, and the universe is still.

Then He that sitteth upon the throne spreads forth his hands, as if to divide the multitude before him: and, as of old, the waters of the ocean rolled back at the bidding of Jehovah, and parted their foaming waves on this side and on that, and opened a way among their silent depths for the passage of his people; so now those human waves divide, and roll back on the right hand and on the left; and by some power, that I knew not of, the elements of good and evil that had so long grown together, like the wheat and the tares, now came forth from each other, and were separated, and stood each alone; and the good were gathered together on the right hand of that flaming throne, and all that was evil mingled in one dark mass of fear and lamentation on the other. And the cries, and the mourning, and the wailing, and the weeping, and the sighing of myriads, went up towards heaven in a mingled murmur, like the hum and stir of life from a mighty and peopled city. And still the waves heaved to and fro like the midnight billows of a rolling sea. But again stillness fell upon the surface of the deep, and there was silence—silence—silence. Then upon the still air there came a voice, not terrible in its strength, not like the trumpet's blast, but soft and quiet as the zephyr's breath, yet full of power, and breathing of the might and majesty of heaven. Every ear drank in the sound, and every word fell with a terrible or a rapturous significance.

"Blessed are the poor in spirit; for *the kingdom of heaven is theirs.*"

"Blessed are they that have mourned; for now they shall be comforted."

"Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit more than the promise."

"Blessed are they who have hungered and thirsted after righteousness; for now they shall drink deep of their hearts' desires."

"Blessed are the merciful; for this is their day of mercy."

And at that word there rose such a cry from the dark myriads on the left, as it was indeed terrible to hear; and in every human language that word "*Mercy*" rose above the universal wail like an echo of agony. The ground beneath them trembled as with an earthquake; and the angels that stood around the throne veiled their faces, and seemed to shrink with more than human sympathy from that cry of man's despair. The voice ceased, as if in pity too. Once that voice



had said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Once it had said, "How often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings—and *ye would not.*" And now! \* \* \* \* \*

Again he waved his hand for silence, and again that voice was heard floating on the still air: "He that had my commandments and kept them, he it was that loved me: and he that loved me shall be loved by my Father, and *I* will love him, and will manifest myself unto him." Then all was still again. Then came a louder voice, as if to prelude or proclaim a sentence: "He that confessed me before men, him will I also confess before my Father and his angels." And then I looked upon him that sat upon the throne, and I saw him turn to those that stood upon his right hand, and he looked upon them; and such love as never beamed upon a human countenance shone forth, and went out, as it were, from before him, and seemed to rest upon that happy multitude: and they that *saw* it not, *felt* it; for the eyes of many were cast down, and their arms were crossed upon their breasts, and their heads were bowed towards the ground, and they seemed as though they could not look upon him who looked thus upon them; yet I could see that they were trembling with hope and joy and expectation, and that their ears were listening for the voice of mercy, and the glad tidings of assured salvation. And some stood with their hands clasped in the hands of the loved ones of their hearts, who had walked with them through life, and had lain down by them in the same grave, and had risen together with them at the call of the awakening trumpet. And as they thus stood in trembling expectation, I heard the voice of the Son of Man in tones which *he* must have listened to who would know them: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, and inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." And when these words were uttered, the whole air seemed filled with sounds such as earth hears not. It might be the song of angels—it might be the music of heaven—I know not. It was as the voice of ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands; and it told of joy, and gratulation, and peace, and salvation, and rest, —eternal rest—eternal—eternal! And did they hear it—that happy multitude for whom heaven sent forth these songs of welcome and rejoicing? I know not. Perhaps their senses were closed to every sound but those words of salvation which had just fallen upon their ear—and sunk into their thirsty souls. But when I looked towards them, I saw that it signified little what they heard *now*. Their joy was perfect—their cup was full. Clasped hands—the close embrace—the silent tear—the upward look of humble gratitude too deep for utterance—which sought not words, but could be read by Him who seeth the heart, and towards whom it rose as the silent breathing of that heart's thanksgiving. The mother—the child—the child of so many tears—so many cares—such unwearied watchings—such earnest pleadings—such unutterable love—now *safe, saved, happy*—the child of heaven—the companion of angels—the seal of God upon his forehead—an eternity of bliss for his inheritance! No more separations—no more tears—no more terrors—no more dark forebodings. And whence comes this joy? Who gave this being, which now, after so many clouds, so many hours of darkness, is at length approaching its

solution, and revealing its origin and its end? Comes it not from the boundless depths of a Father's love? What is your prayer now?—That He will forgive your doubtings, your fears, your misgivings, your feeble, wavering faith. You begin now to see *why* you have thus waited, and wandered, and wept, and sat alone in darkness, and passed through the deep waters, and descended into the dark valley; for now, as you draw near to the gates of light, and look back with reverted eye upon that scene of your existence which is closed for ever, the glory from behind streams brightly on the path that you have trod, illuminating the dark places of the way, making the crooked lines straight, and the rough places plain, and shewing how that road, through all its intricate windings, and gloomy shades, and solitary wastes, was surely leading on to the portals of this heavenly dwelling-place before which your feet now stand. While thus you gaze, the scales fall from your astonished sight—your eyes are opened—the mysterious ways of Providence are understood—the dark enigma of life is solved—the purposes of creative love are laid bare before you—and this hour is one, not of Judgment only, but of *Revelation*. Turn, then, and enter into the mansions of the blest.

Happy souls, your days are ended;  
 All your mourning days below:  
 Go, by angel guards attended,  
 To the home of Jesus, go.

And there are others, too, on whom my eye resteth, among that happy multitude. Why do I see them more than the myriads that surround them? Is memory there? Do the images of earthly years rise again before my sight, and mingle with the wonders and the glories of the heavenly vision? Who are these, and whence come they? They come from their sleep in a far land—far from the graves of their fathers, and the little mounds that heaved over their sleeping children. From those they loved they were divided even in death. They had slept their long sleep under the green waters—alone, among the unknown caverns of the deep. Or they had lain down among the dead of a strange people, and no tear had fallen upon their grave, and no lingering footsteps had returned to tread softly round their quiet bed, and to watch over their silent slumbers. Or they had sunk to rest amid the silence of the solitary wilderness; and they who loved them best had laid them by the banks of the flowing river, or among the sands of the thirsty desert, and had left them there to lie alone till the last trumpet should awaken them, and themselves had journeyed on in loneliness towards that distant land that once had been their *home*, to lay their bones far, far from the solitary resting-place of him who had been all the world to them. These are they, and thence come they. And now they are solitary no longer; now they are no more divided. The call that awakened has re-united them; and they have risen from their long sleep to look again upon each other's face—to hear each other's voice—to clasp the beloved form—and to feel that distance and death can never again come between them from this time—*for evermore*. Henceforth they will walk hand in hand among the gardens of Paradise, and through the courts of Heaven, rejoicing in the light of His countenance who had made them happy, and looking back upon the sorrows of their earthly pilgrimage

as on a dream of darkness from which the voice of morning has awakened them.

And then I looked again towards the scene of judgment, from which I had turned away while gazing on the happy throng I spoke of—and behold! in the midst, before the throne, I saw a great multitude that no man could number; and they stood apart from the two great divisions on the right hand and on the left, and had not been there when I looked before upon the scene. I know not whence they came,—whether they were drawn from the ranks of the blessed, or from among those who stood awaiting their doom on the other side of that burning throne. But there they stood, with bowed heads and downcast eyes, and were trembling with hope and joy, though with these were mingled fear, and shame, and self-abasement; and they seemed as if they could not so much as lift up their eyes to heaven, but felt that they deserved to hear from the awful brightness of the judgment-seat some sentence of reproach and condemnation. Perhaps these were the weak and wandering children who had fallen many times in their sins, and had turned again and sought their Heavenly Father, and been forgiven seventy times seven: and yet, when the evil one allured their hearts again, again they fell, and forgot the commands of their great Taskmaster, and became the obedient slaves of sin; yet had never forgotten Him whose service they had forsaken, and loved not the chains they wore, but from time to time had burst them asunder, and sought his face again with tears and repentant supplications. Perhaps among them were those who had been accepted at the eleventh hour, when the time for mercy and salvation seemed to be almost past. Perhaps there were those, too, whose faith had been weak—whose eyes, when they looked towards heaven, grew dim—who had never wholly given themselves to the service of God because they could not realize his being—and who had thus wandered on through the dark paths of this world's pilgrimage like orphans seeking for a Father, who was yet ever near them and around them. Perhaps there were those who had known the need that never was supplied—the craving that was never satisfied—the vacancy in their being which a trust and faith in God and communion with Him alone could fill—who had thus felt the deep want of his presence, yet had not sought his face, or, having sought him blindly, had not found him;—men whom sorrow had humbled, but had not sublimed; whom it had weaned from earth, but not lifted to heaven; and whose voice of anguish was a *cry* and not a *prayer*. And while I was thus pondering who these might be, and what would be their doom, I heard again the voice of the Son of Man, and I raised my eyes to where he sat upon his throne of glory, and I saw his face as he looked down upon the multitude below, and methought there was darkness on his brow, and a shade of sorrowful reproach passed over the brightness of his countenance. It was as though he had said, “Why will ye die?” or, “All the day long have I stretched out my hands towards you.” And it seemed as if he remembered their transgressions, and their forgetfulness of his commands, and their hardness of heart, and their feeble faith, and as if the Holy Spirit was grieved as he looked upon them. But then, methought, as he gazed longer on those humbled, broken spirits, and remembered the weakness of their nature, and the strength of their



temptations, and the sincerity of their repentance, and knew how their sins had been their suffering, and the darkness of their own souls their punishment for not struggling into the light,—and when he saw how that suffering and that punishment had done their work upon them, and how they were now purified from the stains of sin, and made capable of enjoying the happiness of sanctified spirits, and how they were longing to stand in his presence, and to serve him day and night as the humblest of his children,—methought that look of reproachful sorrow softened into sadness, and then into pity, and then melted into tenderness, and then warmed and brightened into love; and the love deepened as he gazed upon them, and beamed forth from the brightness of his countenance, till heaven was already there, and the glad tidings of salvation were proclaimed before the word of pardon went forth to open for them the gates of immortality. And then he stretched forth his hands toward the multitude, and there came a voice from the throne, and the words of it were these—"Your sins, which are many, are forgiven. Enter ye also into the joy of your Lord."

And then once more the voices of welcoming angels filled the air with sweet and holy melody, and a light from above descended on that happy multitude, and they turned to leave the scene of their judgment, and to follow the steps of those who had been pronounced the blessed of their Father, and who were now thronging towards the gates—no longer strait and narrow—that opened to the dwelling-place of the Most High. And as they drew near, the light grew brighter and more dazzling, till my eyes could no longer gaze upon it; and the figures that I followed in their upward course grew fainter and more bright, and melted into the spiritual forms of angelic natures, and rose, and faded, and vanished from my earthly sight.

And I closed my eyes, and turned away from the brightness I could no longer gaze upon. And my heart was sad and heavy, for I seemed to be shut out from that heavenly home, and to be still an exile and a wanderer in the outer universe.

\* \* \* \* \*

Then I turned once more towards that field of judgment, and the dark multitude that lately peopled it. But I saw it not. The thick darkness of night was around me;—there was silence;—and I was *alone*, as in the valley of Death.

G.

---

#### A MILITANT BISHOP.

ATTERBURY, immediately on the Queen's (Anne) demise, proposed to Bolingbroke to attempt proclaiming James at Charing Cross, and offered himself to head the procession in his lawn sleeves. But Bolingbroke, shrinking from an enterprize so desperate, with the majority of the council and the executive government against them, the Bishop is said to have exclaimed with an oath, "There is the best cause in Europe lost for want of spirit!"—*Lord Mahon's History of England*, I. 138.

## POPULAR EDUCATION.

MY DEAR MR. EDITOR,

I MUST beg you to afford me space for a few observations upon an article entitled *Popular Education*, which appeared in the last number of the *Christian Reformer*. It is in opposition to some of the statements and arguments contained in that article, that I wish to address you.

Nothing contributes more to the satisfactory settlement of a dispute, than a clear enunciation of the principles by which the dispute is intended to be regulated. The principles which ought to be fixed in this instance are those relating to the proper functions of civil government. As, however, I cannot ascertain from what the author of the article in question has said, how he would fix those principles, I am obliged to look for something of a less fundamental kind which may form the ground of my remarks. The nearest approach to what I could desire, I discover in the following sentences:

"Religion is a matter which admits of no concession, of no compromise." \*  
 "Religious liberty in regard to national education requires religious equality." †

"The Establishment is in itself and in its operations utterly incompatible with either religious or educational equality." ‡

"We are and have for many years been resolved never to give our consent, humble as it is, to any public system in which religious distinctions are maintained, and in which the big brother of the Establishment may be encouraged or allowed to browbeat the little brother of Dissent." §

All this I not only cordially assent to, but am willing to accept as constituting the ground of mutual appeal between myself and the gentleman who has thus expressed himself. That religion admits of no compromise; that religious equality ought to be carefully preserved; and that the existing Establishment of religion is not a thing to be encouraged,—these are positions which I propose to shew cannot be consistently maintained in carrying out the scheme for popular education advocated by this writer.

I am not, however, for playing fast and loose with these principles in any degree. I hold them most tenaciously, and require that they be adhered to in repudiation of all educational measures to which they are opposed. I cannot allow that the interests of education should be suffered to balance those of religion, and must therefore consider such opposition as fatal to the system with which it may be connected. Here I am afraid I differ from the author under review, for in another part of his paper he has spoken thus:

"National funds are every year appropriated to the advancement of a religious body already found too powerful for religious equality and the growth and development of free thought. Let us here not be misunderstood. So highly do we value education, so imperatively needful do we hold popular education to be, that even this price we are willing to pay for it—if this price must be paid." ||

A plainer contradiction than that which exists between this declara-

\* *Christian Reformer*, No. lxxxvii. p. 146.

† P. 150.

§ P. 152.

‡ P. 149.

|| P. 141.

tion and the one I last quoted, could scarcely be committed. I am not at all disposed to imitate this contradiction. There is nothing which I should not regard as purchased too dear, at the price of any compromise of religious principle; and it is because I feel that such a compromise is involved in the plan here advocated, that I cannot approve of that plan. The contradiction thus unguardedly put forth is inherent in the case, however cautiously that case may be stated.

In the paper on which I am animadverting, a strenuous attempt is made to distinguish between secular and religious education. I will quote some of the most significant sentences bearing upon this distinction.

"The value of secular education is admitted by all the friends and promoters of popular education. Here conscience says, 'Give,' not 'Withhold.' Does your conscience forbid you to teach arithmetic—geography—history? Does your conscience forbid you to combine industrial training with instructions in the art of reading and writing? Thus far we all go in common. Thus far, then, can we act together. You wish for more. So do we; but what more? Joint action may take place as far as there is universal agreement: and we will go with you in pushing that joint action to its greatest extent. But in our journey we come to a point where we differ—differ seriously, differ at present irreconcilably. There let us stop. At the point where our differences begin must our joint action end. That point is doctrinal religion."\*

"A national education must not teach religion. But what is religion? Where does the secular element end? Where does the religious element begin? Diversities of opinion prevail on the point. Some consider morals a part of religion. Others identify what is called 'the Christian spirit' with the essence of religion. Let each one judge for himself, and let each one act according to his own convictions. But all are of one mind in this, namely, that doctrine is either religion itself, or an essential element of religion, as religion is generally understood and professed. Doctrinal religion, then, is the point which the national educator must not touch."†

Doctrinal religion is to prescribe the line of separation between secular and religious education. But what is doctrinal religion? Is this writer prepared to point out, how the national or any other educator could teach religion except in a doctrinal form? It is doctrine of some kind or other that he must inculcate, if he is to attend to the subject of religion at all. The being of a God is as much a doctrine as is the orthodox scheme of an atonement; and if this distinction be logically preserved, it will exclude from education the simplest elements of religious knowledge.

It is very clear, however, that this definition is not thus intended to be pressed to its logical conclusions. The religion to be neglected is not doctrinal religion, and it ought not to have been so described. The whole tenor of the article indicates that the doctrines which the educator is not to touch, are those held by the different religious sects in this country; and the word properly applicable to them is the word *Christian*, not the word *doctrinal*. There is a form of religion called *natural*, as distinguished from the *Christian* form. It is as much the religion of its professors, as Christianity is that of those who make a Christian profession. This is to be taught, and Christianity is to remain untaught. The State is to patronize the religion of those who simply believe in naturalism, and to forbid instruction by the schoolmaster in

\* P. 145.

† P. 148.



anything else. This is the real thing proposed. It need scarcely be said that, regarded in this light, the scheme involves a palpable violation of the principle of religious equality. A distinction, on the subject of education, between Christian doctrines and other religious doctrines, is to be made and enforced in favour of the latter.

It is quite beside the question to say, "Thus far we go in common, and therefore we can thus far act together." The important matter is, not how far we go in common, but where we are respectively going to. Till that matter be satisfactorily settled, we cannot even start in company. If one of us is to be helped to the full accomplishment of his religious objects, and the accomplishment of the objects of another is to be refused, a comparative injustice is done; which is rather increased than softened by the consideration that the mutual agreement between the two has been so managed that he who suffers the injustice has been made to play into an opponent's hands.

Religion may be connected with education in two ways. Its truths may be added to the other truths which are taught; and those other truths may also be modified according to its requirements. Thus the doctrines of Christianity may be added to those of physical science; and moral statements may also be modified by religious considerations. Suppose it be granted, for argument's sake, that the schoolmaster can be properly relieved from an attention to the first of these connections; yet he cannot be relieved from an interference with the second. The morality he inculcates must be either represented in the light of religious and Christian sanctions, or not. Between these representations there is a very wide difference indeed, which will forbid a religious or Christian man from countenancing the moral teaching in which religion and Christianity are not acknowledged. Is it right that such a man should be required to compromise his religious views by being made to support such teaching? Certainly not. If, as we are told, "some consider morals as a part of religion," the conclusion to be adopted is not, "let each one judge for himself, and let each one act according to his own convictions," but it is, that morals should not be taught at all unless the religious convictions of these parties can be satisfied. They cannot be satisfied and the principle of religious equality at the same time preserved; while, on the other hand, not to teach morals at all, would be to reduce the teaching to a kind of secularity which no one would think of defending.

There is a view of the union between secular and religious education, which, though it has escaped the attention of the author of the paper under notice, is, to my mind, of far more importance than anything he has brought forward. Man possesses a religious nature. His faculties work as naturally in the direction of religion, as in any other direction to which they are appointed. Their religious operation, for right or wrong, for good or evil, cannot be prevented. Religious, in some sense, man must be; and every form of education you apply to him has a corresponding effect upon his religious character. If you neglect to teach him truth with regard to religion, you do not thereby put a stop to the religious manifestation in his case; you only produce a manifestation which answers to your neglect. You produce such a manifestation as would be produced intellectually, if the cultivation of his reasoning powers was neglected. He would, in spite of the neglect,

exercise those powers; but he would exercise them erroneously and unprofitably. So, under the influence of mere secular training, a man would grow up religious according to a deficient and perverted conception of religion. The deficiency and perversion would in that case be just as fairly traceable to the negative sort of training given, as it might in another case be traced to a training positively objectionable. To cultivate the other parts of human nature, while the religious part was passed by, would not be to lessen, but to increase, the evil. It would be to substitute deformity for general weakness. It is according to such considerations as these that the separation advocated in the instance before us must be judged. It must be judged as to its religious results. Those results will be as distinctive as though they were directly and professedly contemplated by the scheme. Neither parental nor clerical agency will supply the want which the agency of the schoolmaster is forbidden to meet; but the child will grow up religious nevertheless. He will be religious after a fashion of religion which all wise and good men deprecate. It is for the extension of this religion that the nation is to be taxed. Christian men will not be reconciled to the payment by such appeals as, "Does your conscience forbid you to teach arithmetic, geography, history?" They know that the interests of religion are as much involved in the teaching which is thus described, as though the word religion were added to the description. They know that this not only is, but must be, the case. They disapprove of the religious influence which is thus to be exerted. They plead the rights of conscience in opposition to the compulsion to be exercised upon themselves, and the patronage to be extended to others in its favour; and their plea can be fully justified on the grounds both of religious liberty and religious equality.

We are invited to anticipate the time, when this so-called secular education shall become national, being provided for and enforced throughout the nation by Act of Parliament. In the present religious condition of this country, such an anticipation seems to me one of the wildest ideas that can enter the human head. But though I cannot entertain it for a single moment, I can easily place before myself, in its stead, the state of things with regard to Government education which the agitation for a purely secular plan will contribute to produce.

If Lord Derby's administration should continue in power, the cry for State interference which is thus raised will be turned to the advantage of the Church of England alone. The gentlemen who have called out so loudly for secular help will, in this event, find that it would have been much better for them to have borne their own burden, than to have risked an encounter with the spectre which may answer to their call.

But if Lord Derby's administration should be succeeded by even a more liberal government than the last, the utmost that can be expected is, that a provision for mere secular teaching may, under certain circumstances, be added to the sectarian system which at present prevails. That system, after being placed in a more organized form, may be connected with a distinct class of schools from which religious teaching is professedly excluded. Nothing beyond this can be reasonably looked for. The projection of the Manchester and Salford Education plan, and the favour with which it has been received, would alone prove the

unreasonableness of expecting anything more favourable to the secular views, than this mixed system.

I am inclined to think that this would satisfy a large number of the supporters of the National Public School Association. The manner in which many of them have defended the Privy Council Minutes on Education; the sentiments delivered from time to time at public meetings of this Association; the character of the Bill proposed by Mr. Fox in 1850; and, above all, the clauses in the National School Bill lately issued, which provide for the sustentation of existing schools under their present managers,—these things are quite sufficient to prove that the friends of a purely secular education are not prepared to stand or fall by their own scheme, in its proper integrity. The secular movement is in reality animated by a class of persons who, having been excluded on religious grounds from participating in the benefits of the present Parliamentary grant, will be quite content if a share of this grant be in future given to them. That boon may be obtained, but no greater one is likely to be obtained.

What, then, will be the probable result, as far as the interests of religious liberty are concerned? I reply, that the dangers insisted upon in this very paper as attaching to the Privy Council proceedings and the Manchester and Salford system will be more than realized.

It may, indeed, be said, that we have no right to argue results from circumstances which the National Public School Association neither sanctions nor contemplates. I for one, however, much prefer to be guided in this matter by a calculation of probabilities, than by the mere paper constitution put forward by the Association. "No wise man," we are told, "will give money for one object, knowing or fearing it may be applied to another. And no upright man, foreseeing a misapplication, will do anything which may tend to occasion or promote it."\* What is thus true of the appropriation of money, is equally true of any other support which a proposed object may require. Foreseeing a misapplication in the case immediately before me, I wisely withhold my support on that ground; and recommend to all whom it may concern the uprightness which abstains from giving any occasion to the realization of my fears.

One result of the present agitation, if it should terminate in the way I have pointed out, will be the perpetuation of the injustice belonging to the position of the Church of England. The big brother of the Establishment will be suffered in the public school to browbeat the little brother of Dissent.

"Educational equality, religious equality, can never be enjoyed, if the Establishment . . . enters as an element into our system of national education. . . . If the Establishment comes, adieu to equality, adieu to liberty! Our evidence is the history of the Establishment ever since it became an Establishment. What! has the history of the last three hundred years been gone through by Englishmen in vain? Are not Dissenters justified in fearing and suspecting even the apparent liberality of the Establishment? What have Churchmen yielded which they could have retained? What practical recognition of religious equality have they ever given? What ground is there for believing that a system of general education originated by them would be liberally or fairly worked?"†

---

\* P. 147.

† P. 150.



The injustice necessarily arising from the position of the Establishment is not the only injustice of the same kind to be apprehended. Other sects, besides that of the Church of England, would become virtually endowed by any educational system which accommodated itself to the secular plan. I am not disposed to go so far as our author, who asserts, that "the humbler classes have been the hunting-ground of the sects;"\* but I cannot give these sects credit for applying with fairness the national funds they might thus obtain. Sectarian purposes would overbear the educational ones professed, and the friends of religious freedom would have, in every locality, to contend with powerful organizations, which set themselves against the plainest social rights. The contention in favour of those rights would be connected with every possible disadvantage. The ground of education would form a new battle-field, on which every form of religious bigotry and ecclesiastical domination would set up its standard of offence.

There is another kind of injustice which would be involved in the sectarian patronage that cannot but be expected to accompany any concession to the demands for secular education. It is an injustice which would attach to the secular scheme if that were established alone; but which perhaps would be more plainly developed in the mixed scheme most likely to be established in its place. Judging from appearances, a great mass of Nonconformists will refuse, on conscientious grounds, to accept the offers of educational assistance that may be made to them. They will thus suffer to the degree in which others are treated with superior favour. If their scruples be really conscientious ones, they will unjustly suffer in this regard. Their suffering will not merely consist in the feeling of injury with which they must contemplate the difference between their civil position and that occupied by others. This difference will have the effect of limiting and weakening, and in many cases nullifying, their efforts in the cause of popular education. Their schools will be destroyed or depressed by rival schools, enjoying a public support, which they cannot claim. This may perhaps seem a matter of small importance to a person who says of these parties, "They disown the obligation of taking measures for the general education of the people, and do little within their own particular sphere for the augmentation and improvement of their present educational appliances."† Any one who chooses to inquire will, however, find that this assertion is as directly opposed to fact as any assertion on the subject could be. One distinction between the Voluntaries and the Government education-men is, that the former are attempting themselves to do what the latter call upon others to do for them; and to represent the adherents of Voluntaryism as crying, "Let things alone," is as inapplicable to their practice as it is contrary to their principles. But whether they be faithful to their principles or not; and though "their public advocates are men of ordinary ability and small social power, who possess no influence with the mass of the people, and can but faintly make their voice heard in Parliament,"‡ they are entitled to such an equality in the administration of civil affairs as may protect them from being counteracted in their benevolent designs by the influence of the taxes they contribute to raise. It has been granted,

\* P. 137.

† P. 133.

‡ P. 133.

that "in matters of conscience the rights of minorities, the rights of even small minorities, demand and deserve respect;"\* and though such a sentiment expresses very imperfectly the views of religious liberty I entertain, it alone is sufficient to stamp with injustice the state of things I am now endeavouring to expose. It is much more than a small minority, from whom, in that state of things, respect would be withheld; but the injustice done should be measured not by any respect due to minorities, small or great, but by the impartial freedom which "in matters of conscience" is the privilege of every individual man.

I cannot, as I had originally intended, enter into a defence of the voluntary principle in its application to popular education. A word or two upon the attempt which is here made to impugn the efficiency of that principle must, however, be added.

"Chiefly are the Voluntaries wrong in what they call their principle. What is that principle? They call it 'voluntaryism,' 'willinghood.' The ideas are as loose as the words are new. Let us take the Saxon term, as more easy of general comprehension. 'Willinghood' does or will do what is needed in popular education. Whose willinghood? That of the people themselves? The assumption is contradicted by fact. The willinghood of the sects? Why, that is the very thing that has left us in our present unsatisfactory condition. The willinghood of individuals? It is utterly insufficient for the task. The willinghood of property? Property avoids its obligations. The fact comes out in the fullest evidence in the Reports of Her Majesty's Educational Commissioners. Besides, what does this willinghood mean? Unless there be willinghood on the part of the nation, a national provision can never be made. A nation willing to tax itself for popular education does not depart from willinghood. Here, then, voluntaryism has no distinctive ground. Is, then, the required willinghood found in the payment of the contribution? The payments which voluntaryism actually obtains can be called voluntary contributions only by a straining of the terms employed. They are for the most part not free-will offerings, not spontaneous gifts, but imposts rated in committee, enjoined in the pulpit, and enforced on the platform. They are the fruits not so much of individual benevolence as of sectarian organization and oratorical excitements. Real willinghood, we opine, would produce even less than is produced by 'denominational' zeal. The efforts dictated by that zeal we do not blame. It is the logical position of Voluntaries we are examining."†

This reasoning would be just as pertinent against the application of voluntaryism to religion, as it is against its application to education. The willinghood of the people, of sects, and of individuals, has left the existing religion of our country in a very unsatisfactory condition; and property avoids its obligations on that subject, as it does on most others. Yet I suppose it would be conceded that willinghood is the only true principle of religious support and extension. Why the want of zeal on the part of those to whom the administration of a principle is intrusted should be carried to the account of the principle itself, or how the nature of a principle can be justly confounded with its confessedly partial operations, remains to be shewn; but this, I know, that if Government interference is to be judged by such rules as are here applied to voluntary action, all dependence upon its efficiency for educational purposes must be abandoned.

If it be true that the enforcement of a national provision for educa-

\* P. 146.

† P. 135.

tion is no departure from willingness as far as the subject of education is concerned, then the existing religious Establishment involves no departure from willingness as far as religion is concerned. Thus black is white and white is black. The proof of voluntarism may be the compulsion it exercises; on the same principle that an attempt of one portion of the people to force an offensive imposition upon the rest is complimented under the generous character of "a nation willing to tax itself."

Voluntarism as to payment, simply consists in a willingness to pay. When a payment is unwillingly made, it ceases to be voluntary; but it does not lose that quality when the willingness is produced by legitimate persuasion. It is not necessary that voluntary payments should be "spontaneous gifts;" and if "the efforts dictated by denominational zeal are not to be blamed," they are as reconcilable with willingness as are the freest suggestions of "individual benevolence."

"The logical position of Voluntaries" is, I opine, quite safe, if it can only be assailed by such "examinations" as this.

I am yours faithfully,

*March 15, 1852.*

T.

#### MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

SIR,

MY object has been answered in having drawn attention to the points to be considered by the Committee of the Trustees. And I am of all persons the least entitled to criticise closely the answers my letter has produced; yet you will indulge me when I protest against the periphrastic re-statement and misinterpretation of the commencement of my letter by M. N. C. I sympathize so much with M. N. C., that I would rather think than not that it is as much my fault as his when he supposes me to be of opinion that "Unitarianism is unfitted for the poor and unlearned;" that is, in its own nature and by its own fault so unfitted. I admit this would be a sentence of condemnation. It is the charge brought by the orthodox against us, and, as a charge, slanderous. In shewing how this differs from the opinion I meant to assert, I shall, I hope, rectify a mistake frequently made, and not regret any obscurity of language on my part which occasioned the misapprehension of M. N. C., for the subject is of greater importance than any College question.

I hold Unitarianism to be Christianity stripped of a load of superstitious accompaniments and false doctrines, disgusting and odious to an enlightened understanding; and by "Unitarian theology" I mean the systematic exposure of these false doctrines. I have lived in Roman Catholic countries, and in my childhood was familiar with Calvinistic orthodoxy; and I believe that the great body of the uneducated and ignorant people, those even who, notwithstanding their ignorance and erroneous notions, are sincere, pious Christians, conscientious as well as superstitious, and who love their church and their creed, not merely in spite of, but on account of, the very doctrines which others in an advanced stage of civilization abhor. What an object of intense love to millions of pious Catholic girls is Mary the Virgin Mother! How grateful does the alarmed Romanist feel towards his priest, who, having first terrified him by the exhibition to him of "Hell opened to Christians," a book of engravings shewing all the tortures of hell, and an eloquent declamation, ends by telling him, "Now, mark how God loves you! from all these horrors you are set free on the easy condition of submission to the Church"! Surely M. N. C. must be aware that there is in the idea of "redemption by the blood



of a dying God," and the other elements of orthodoxy, a fascination to the many, though to the few these same doctrines are repulsive. It is still my opinion that, in addressing the masses trained to and adopting these notions, a Channing, with equal abilities and moral qualities of every kind, would have slight influence compared with a Whitfield or a Wesley.

What, then, is the conclusion? Not that Unitarianism is unfitted to the ignorant, but that the ignorant are unfitted to Unitarianism. Now, here let me add an important remark on logic, in its application to questions which concern taste, the affections and the business of life. A person who was accustomed to the dry formularies of logic and nothing else might be apt to say, "A=B is just the same position as B=A; therefore it is indifferent whether you say Unitarianism is unfitted for the poor and ignorant, or the poor and ignorant are unfitted for Unitarianism." But this is a very great mistake; for in all questions appertaining to man and ethics in their widest sense, there is something beyond the mere grammatical or logical import of the thought, there is also the element of sentiment or feeling. I hope M. N. C. will not feel it incumbent on him to cast off his Unitarian pastor, because he is convinced that that pastor cannot find a numerous flock in the present state of the world. The great majority will not listen to the voice of the charmer, "charm he never so wisely." This is a fact. Let us beware of the too common mistake of inferring the wisdom from its success. If that were true, what must we think, not merely of Unitarianism compared with Orthodoxy, but of Protestantism compared with Romanism, Christianity with Mohametanism, Buddhism, &c.?

One other remark in explanation of the fact that Unitarians are the few, the Orthodox the many, which at the same time will further account for M. N. C.'s misapprehension of the drift of my remark. The well-known line,

"Reason the helm and passion is the gale,"

will serve to illustrate the question raised by the rather unfortunate term, *rational religion*. I call it unfortunate, because the Orthodox impute to the Unitarians the doctrine that their religion is founded on reason, as if that were the active principle; and Unitarians have not been always sufficiently careful to limit the use of reason to its correcting and qualifying function. For this purpose he might have used the line of Pope. The gale is that religious impulse which is common to all the pious and devout of every sect and community; it is by the happy use of the helm that the voyage is directed safely to the right port. Colleges do not supply the gale, nor is the pupil sent there that he may be taught piety or devotional impulse. This he takes with him, though, in being guided, it may be improved (for I do not expect that this or any other image should go on all fours). Now, whether it be matter of reproach or praise, it is an indisputable fact that among the Unitarians, who are generally the educated, is found a preponderance of *thought*. It is equally certain that it is among the uneducated masses that an appeal to their *sensibility* may be directly made, and all correction by the reason or intelligence reprov'd and checked, with the greatest success. Hence I come to the conclusion that the education of the Unitarian theological teacher must be adapted to this state of things. He must not have the training of a field-preacher. And it will be to as little purpose if he strive to become the *immediate* instructor of the masses (they are reserved for the missionary, and him I suppose to be an altogether different character), as it would have been if the most accomplished Cambridge lecturer at St. Mary's had endeavoured to rival Robert Robinson's village discourses at Chesterton. I hope your correspondent will not feel it necessary to abandon the College whose scheme is founded on this idea, for, if so, the three letters which he has adopted as his are precisely the three he should have avoided, that is, *M*(anchester) *N*(ew) *C*(ollege).

A CONSTANT READER.

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*An Epitome of the Evidence given before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Church Rates, in the Session of 1851.* By J. S. Trelawney, Esq., M.P., Chairman of the Committee. 8vo. Pp. 84. London—Theobald. 1852.

IN April last, Mr. Trelawney obtained a Committee to consider the law of church-rates, and the difference of practice which exists in various parts of the country in the assessment and levy of such rates, and to report their observations to the House. The Committee contained some notable men. Sir R. H. Inglis, Mr. Henley, Mr. Hope, &c., would be zealous champions for the immunities and privileges of the Church; and the Chairman, Mr. Bright, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Heyworth, &c., not less zealous protectors of the rights of Nonconformists. Before the close of the session, the Committee reported the evidence taken, the substance of which is condensed in this pamphlet. It contains much valuable local, legal and historical information. That given by Dr. Lushington is particularly valuable. We string together a few facts taken almost at random from the evidence. The particulars of the Braintree case are given by witnesses on both sides. £100 a-year sufficed to pay the church-rate before disputes arose. In the course of a few years the parish has been put to £1600 expense in litigating the question of church-rates. At many places, such as Birmingham, Sheffield, Tavistock, Leeds, Manchester, Leicester (four parishes out of five), no church-rate has been enforced for many years. Speaking from the experience of forty years, Dr. Lushington said, "I have seen not merely litigation in courts, but I have seen every description of heart-burning and quarrels; the separation of parishes into two parties, not precisely upon religious scruples, but from the feeling of one party towards the other, and so on; and it has created greater feuds than any other subject that I know. Every clergyman of discretion keeps himself as far as possible aloof and away from church-rates, and he says, 'That is the business of the churchwarden and the vestry, it is not mine.' If he imprudently intermixes himself with the church-rate, then he is very likely to get into a difficulty; but all the prudent clergy whom I have known have always kept apart."

Evidence was given by various parties shewing the utter uncertainty existing respecting the law of church-rates, and the tortuosity and tediousness and costliness of law proceedings. Dr. Lushington stated (p. 41) that a church-rate cause being commenced in the diocese of Chester, would be tried first in that diocese, and would probably last a twelvemonth there—a litigated cause; then it would go on to the Prerogative Court of York, where it would be tried and take a year more; and then it would come up to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the ultimate court of appeal. How long it would take there would depend upon various circumstances. In answer to another question, he stated that a church-rate cause might be carried from the Magistrates to the Consistory Court, from the Court of Arches to the Queen's Bench, thence to the Exchequer Chamber, and ultimately to the House of Lords; then back again to the Ecclesiastical Courts, and ultimately to the Privy Council. The Braintree case more than followed this tedious and costly course. In one respect it doubled it, having been twice to the Queen's Bench. Attorneys and proctors are costly servants; while they are being feed, the parish is getting poor, and the fabric of the Church falling into decay.

At Melbourn, in Cambridgeshire, a decision was obtained against a man for the sum of 19s. 4½d., but the proctor's bill, only one item in the total costs of the litigation, amounted to £266. The Vicar of Melbourn gave evidence that the litigation in his parish had seriously affected its peace; in some

cases friendly intercourse previously existing between Churchmen and Dissenters had been put an end to. Sermons had been preached which embittered the minds of people against the Church. Exclusive dealing took place. "He regarded the system as a social evil. Pamphlets were published, and bad names given to the church-people. There was 'Judas Bond-church' and 'Paul Free-church;' the former meaning the Church of England, the latter Dissent. 'Daniel Daylight' was the Dissenting minister, and so on. It raised a very angry feeling."

With one fact, appearing again and again in the evidence tendered to the Committee, we are much impressed, viz., the success generally attending an attempt to raise the required amount by voluntary subscriptions, even where previously feeling has been embittered by a struggle. We believe that in many ways the Church of England is a heavy loser by extorted church-rates. How the question is to be settled we know not. To take the amount from the consolidated fund is open to the strongest objections. It contains the essence of the present evil without any of its preventives; it takes away local watchfulness and control; and the pecuniary burthen would, under such circumstances, be in danger of a large increase. It is certain that church property in this country is, from the nature of its tenure, badly and improvidently managed. Pass it entirely into the hands of Commissioners with large powers, and let the balance of profit form a fund for the payment of the support of the fabric of our parish churches. Let the actual expense of worship after this be charged on the congregation by pew-rents or voluntary subscriptions. Churchmen allege, in reply, that it would be a bonus on Dissent. We candidly confess we have little expectation of a satisfactory settlement of the question in the present temper of ecclesiastics. In a few years, when the district churches created under Peel's Act will be able to ask for rates (twenty years after their consecration), the question will assume increased importance.

At pp. 53 and 54, are some curious statistics by Mr. Edward Baines respecting the increase, since 1800, of churches and Dissenting places of worship in the manufacturing districts. The Sunday scholars taught by the Church in that district he estimates at 123,451—by Dissenters, at 285,080. He conjectures that the average amount raised by Dissenting congregations for the maintenance of each minister, fabric and worship, is about £80 per annum. The number of chapels is 14,340, so that, according to Mr. Baines, a sum of £1,147,200 is annually raised by Dissenters for the support of their worship. His estimate is exclusive of the sums raised for the maintenance of colleges, missionary and other benevolent societies.

---

### *Faith Strengthened.*

THE above is the title of a book lately translated from the Hebrew, by a learned and enlightened member of the Reformed Jews. The original work was written by Rabbi Ben Abraham, in A.M. 5393. He was a native of Lithuania, and is designated in the Preface as "the most powerful opponent and refutant of the doctrines and dogmas of Christianity that had ever appeared among the Jews." He professes that "the great design of his work was to establish and make manifest the sublime truths of Israel's faith, and expose and refute the erroneous views on which Christianity is founded." As far as regards the refutation of the leading doctrines of the Romish and English Church, we think the learned Rabbi has been successful; and the reasons he assigns, and the discrepancies he exposes in the doctrines of Jesus and the so-called orthodox faith, are exactly such as lead us to become Non-conformists and Unitarians. He writes as if he considered that the miraculous conception, the Trinity and the Atonement, were the essentials of Christianity; in fact, that the belief in them alone constituted a Christian. This learned Jew makes no attempt to invalidate the existence of Jesus, the truth of his prophecies, or the evidence of miracles; but he turns the whole weight



of his argument on the impossibility of Jesus being the Almighty Creator of the universe, if his own words, as recorded in the "*so-called*" New Testament, be true. So very slight is the objection to Christianity *proper* and the evidence of the gospel, that we think that the Unitarian will find, after the perusal of the work, his own "*faith strengthened*."

It is a singular and significant fact, that in a space of more than 200 years, no intelligent and inquiring Jew should have written any work of equal importance to this, as we are assured is the case in the translator's Preface. Enthralled as the Jews have been by ritual observances, it is only within the last few years that they have shewn a desire to spiritualize their religion; and a schism has lately occurred, a large portion of them having thrown off the yoke of *tradition*, and, calling themselves reformers, adhere only to the *written law*. It is remarkable that these *formalists* should have made a movement directly opposed to the schism in the English Church, which has led to the adoption of tradition and the rejection of scripture authority alone. Strange perversities in human nature!

Many arguments in "*Faith Strengthened*" are too trite and familiar to be worth transcribing, but some may be interesting from their peculiar turn of thought and quaint phraseology; e. g., "It is remarkable that Christians are desirous to make us believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is so totally unauthorized by our Holy Bible, and even by their own New Testament." (P. 47.) Then follows a series of texts establishing the Divine Unity of God. The author continues:

"This absolute Unity cannot, under any logical view, be divided into a Duality or a Trinity. If such division is to be forced upon the faith of man, reason remonstrates against it. The faculty of thought given to us by the Almighty, protests against a false representation of the Divine Being, and proves that God has constituted the mind in such a manner as to worship Him in accordance with His true attributes. From the moment that a divisibility of essence is attributed to God, we should be compelled to maintain, with the polytheists, that He is deficient of omnipresence, and that He is comparable with created matter. How can we, then, repudiate such clear testimony of God's Unity as are contained in passages like the following: Isaiah xl. 18,—'And unto whom will ye liken God, and what likeness have ye to compare unto Him?' We cannot even grant that God from His own resolve would reproduce and double or treble Himself. Such an assumption could only spring from the narrowest views of a sophistical or a perverted mind; but it could not emanate from a faith which commands veneration and rational obedience."

In page 50 we have—

"In the very prayer instituted by Jesus, and denominated after him the 'Lord's Prayer,' his disciples are taught to invoke the Father who is in heaven, but are *not* told to use the combination subsequently made, of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. We see clearly that the New Testament affords not a single evidence to authorize a change from the pure belief in the Divine Unity to the complex and unintelligible dogma of that of the Trinity."

Chapter xlix. commences thus:

"An extraordinary degree of inconsistency presents itself in numerous points when we compare the doctrines of the Christians with the teachings of Jesus and his apostles. In the first place, we find that Jesus does not, in any part of the New Testament, call himself '*God*,' but continually calls himself '*Man*,' or '*the Son of Man*.' The title of divinity attributed to Jesus is consequently conferred upon him without the sanction of that Book, the authority of which can alone be of value to the Christians."

Amongst other very just accusations against the Christians for not acting up to their acknowledged authority, this scrutinizing author alleges the following:

"In visiting upon the Jews the death of Jesus, the Christians are acting against his expressed opinion; for, according to Luke xxiii. 34, Jesus said, '*Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do*!'"

The genealogy in the first chapter of Matthew is quite subverted by Rabbi Ben Abraham, and he proves that Luke materially differs from the former evangelist. This has been long acknowledged. He considers that the doctrine of the miraculous conception was invented, "*that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet;*" and this prophecy, he says, was given to Ahaz, king of Judah, in order to allay his apprehensions regarding the two kings who were to come and carry on war against Jerusalem. Isaiah vii. 14: "Behold, the *young woman*," &c.,—mistranslated *virgin*. Relative to the temptation in the wilderness, our author says,

"The reader must certainly perceive by this narrative that the Jesus tempted by Satan is not intended to pass for a God incarnate. For can any man in his sound senses suppose that Satan would have presumed to tempt one whom he knew to be a God?—or can it be imagined that he would have dared, as a creature, to lead him away by force against his will? Reason recoils from such a belief."

Chap. xvii.: "It is related in Matthew xiii. 55, that the Jews said of Jesus, '*Is not this the carpenter's son?*' And is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?' How, then, can the Christians constantly worship Mary as a virgin, she having given birth to the several brothers and sisters of Jesus? In John vi. 42, '*Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?*' These passages afford a complete refutation of the doctrine of the miraculous conception of Jesus, and thereby undermine the groundwork of the Christian faith."

The learned Talmudist confutes by tradition what his own people are reported to have said of Jesus—"How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" He informs us that "Rabbi Joshua Ben Perachiah was the teacher of Jesus, and that master and scholar fled into Egypt to escape the persecution of King Janai!" If this be authentic, it does not invalidate the truth of the evangelist, but rather shews the ignorance of the Jews who marvelled at the wisdom of our Lord. The conclusion which our Hebrew author draws from the xviiith chapter of John—"Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee," &c.; "*I in them, and Thou in me,*" &c., is very direct:

"The junction of Father and Son is conferred also on the twelve apostles. If, therefore, the Christians thought it necessary to change their belief in the Divine Unity, they were not justified in adopting the term '*Trinity*,' inasmuch as the twelve apostles are placed on an equality with Jesus, and they might with the same latitude of argument be well included in the coalition of Divine personages."

In Chapter lv. we have—

"And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou has sent' (John xvii. 3). In this verse, Jesus acknowledged himself to be merely a messenger, and not an integral part, of the Deity. The awe and worship due to the Almighty is also, in 1 Tim. i. 17, declared to belong to God alone; for we find there, 'Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.' If Jesus does not share the glory of God, he must be dependent on the will of his Creator, like every other creature.

"John xx. 17: 'Jesus saith unto her (Mary Magdalene), Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God.' Jesus shewed here clearly that he was no God, but was in the same subjection to God as his brethren. It cannot, therefore, be asserted on the authority of this passage, that Jesus meant anything more by styling himself 'the Son of God,' than the Holy Scriptures indicate by such passages as Deut. xiv. 1, 'Ye are children of the Lord your God.' The expression '*Son of God*' has not the slightest reference to a superhuman being.

"In Acts xxviii. 3, it is related that Paul being bitten by a viper, felt no harm from the poisonous bite, and was therefore held by the *barbarians* surrounding him to be a God. The ease with which a human being was deified in those

days, accounts for the astounding superstitious belief that Jesus was at the same time a mortal and a God."

The first part of the volume is occupied in controverting the application of the prophecies in Isaiah to the Messiah: most of them, our author proves with very conclusive arguments, bear reference to Hezekiah. It seems, too, that many of the Psalms have been wrested from their original significance in our received Version by the dedication, viz., "A Psalm of David," which ought, according to this writer, in many instances to be entitled, "A Psalm to David," the original Hebrew word being capable of both translations.

We have omitted the discussion of the Old-Testament evidences, in order to give the Jewish author's exposition of the instability, or rather the total want, of foundation on which the popular Christian doctrines stand, especially the miraculous birth of Christ and the Trinity. Whilst studying the New Testament, we think the pious Jew must have imbibed somewhat of its spirit and felt its divine influence; for with all his Judaic prejudices, he writes in a deferential spirit, his indignation only being expressed at the corrupt state of Christian dogmas compared with the original pure source from whence they flowed.

The above extracts are offered chiefly as curiosities, emanating from the pen of a Jew. He proves, we think, that the name of *infidels* may with most truth be applied to those who are *unfaithful* to the evidence vouchsafed to them by Christ and his apostles, whilst they acknowledge their allegiance to him and glory in his name.

The translation is not *published*, having been only compiled and printed for distribution amongst the translator's friends and co-religionists. An abridgement of it might form a striking and useful tract.

*The Congregational Year-Book for 1851.* London—Jackson and Walford.

ANOTHER volume of Congregational statistics of nearly three hundred pages. We note in looking through it a few facts. From the report of the proceedings of the Congregational Union, we observe that Dr. Campbell, the conductor of the *Christian Witness* and the *British Banner*, notwithstanding all the objections made to him at a previous meeting, still sits on their editorial throne. The profits of the Magazines during 1850 amounted to £1046.—It is a good sign that 2000 copies of the edition of John Robinson's Works were subscribed for before their publication.—Here and there, in the addresses delivered before the Congregational Union, we are reminded that some intolerance still clings to Congregationalism. At the autumnal assembly at Northampton (where it was the fashion to do honour to the memory of Doddridge, but whose mild and catholic spirit his eulogists did not always imitate), the Rev. John Kelly, the Chairman, talked of the "heresy" of the Presbyterian body, the Arianism of the last century passing on to the "dreary negations of Socinianism" (p. 67). The Rev. H. R. Reynolds, of Leeds, in an address prepared for the occasion, on "Scepticism and its Counteraction," thus spoke on behalf of himself and his denomination: "We deem that Unitarian an unbeliever who denies the divinity and sacrifice of the Son of God, who trifles with the authority of the apostles, who disbelieves the immortality of the soul." By divinity Mr. Reynolds meant "deity," and by sacrifice, "atoning sacrifice." When fixing the brand of unbelief against some of his fellow-christians, this gentleman should, especially in a *concio ad clerum*, be precise in his statements. The allegation that it is a characteristic of Unitarians to trifle with the authority of the apostles and to disbelieve the immortality of the soul, is something more and far worse than a loose and inaccurate statement. If a difference from Mr. Reynolds' belief on the subject of Christ's deity and atonement, or on the authority of the apostles, or the philosophical doctrine (for the Scriptures teach us little or nothing on the subject) of the natural immortality of the soul, makes a man an unbeliever, will not a disbelief of eternal torments



in like manner unchristianize a man?—and if so, some whom Mr. Reynolds addressed were as little Christians as the unbelieving Unitarians. Mr. Reynolds, in the exercise of his theological chivalry, proceeds to shiver a lance against the author of the Creed of Christendom, whom he accuses of mixing up all kinds of incongruous infidelity—"the theories of De Wette and Paulus and Eichorn," "some of the spiritualism of Schleiermacher, the raving of Rousseau, and the historical criticism of Strauss." But Mr. Reynolds, not content with being the guardian and champion of Congregationalist orthodoxy, puts in a claim for the jestership of the Congregational Union, and in our judgment carries off the cap and bells, by the following veritable tale, apropos of the infidels of whom he is speaking:—"In this treatment of the divine truth, they remind me of the man who was resolved to destroy himself, and so thought he would take equal portions of arsenic, corrosive sublimate, strychnia and laudanum, and for fear they might not act, tied a noose round his neck at the same moment, in order to ensure strangulation; but through some extraordinary blunder, the only effect of this awful draught was to convulse him out of the rope, and leave him alive after all."—To turn to something better: During 1851, there were 91 charges accepted and ministers ordained. Forty-three ministers died between December 1850 and 1851, giving an average age at their time of death of 59 years and 10 months, with an average duration of ministry of rather more than 36 years. The more eminent of the Congregational ministers deceased during the year were Ingram Cobbin, James Knight, John Philip, D.D., John Pye Smith, D.D., and Algernon Wells.—Some valuable information is given respecting Dissenting Academies, both past and present. It is stated that 546 literary degrees have been conferred by the University of London since its establishment, of which 130, about one-fourth, have been bestowed on alumni of Congregational Colleges. In 1851, 11 such alumni graduated, and a like number matriculated. Forty Congregational ministers have received testimonials during the year. Thirty-four chapels have been built or rebuilt—the average number of sittings appears to be about 770—at an average cost of £2444. There are 16 colleges and theological academies in connection with the Congregational body, containing about 230 students. From the ministers of the Congregational body there have issued during the year about 141 publications, but this list includes single sermons and other very slight works. As a whole, this volume is creditable to the industry of its editors.

---

*John Milton: a Biography especially designed to exhibit the Ecclesiastical Principles of that illustrious Man.* By Cyrus R. Edmonds. Pp. 251. London—Cockshaw. 1851.

THE life of Milton has to be written. We do not believe the time has yet come for the execution of a biography commensurate with his genius. Until a second Milton shall arise—a man gifted with sublime imagination, a profound politician, and a fearless asserter of unpopular truth in both politics and religion—we have little hope of seeing the work suitably executed. In the mean time, we are prepared to welcome the attempts of men of various opinions to express their several conceptions of the character of their great countryman. Mr. Edmonds' purpose has been to present Milton afresh to the public as the champion of political and especially of religious liberty. Those that have studied the prose writings of Milton, which are inferior (if at all) only to his poetry, know what invaluable materials they furnish to the advocate of free inquiry and free speech on all the subjects interesting to the human intellect and soul. There is much in Mr. Edmonds' little book to commend, but his account of Milton's "Treatise on Christian Doctrine" is neither clear nor fair. No reader unacquainted with that extraordinary book would gather from Mr. Edmonds' account of it (pp. 243, 244) any adequate opinion of the boldness and great extent of John Milton's "heresy." Respect-

ing Milton's unconcealed Antitrinitarianism, there seems to be a tacit agreement amongst recent biographers and critics to veil it as much as possible from the public eye.

---

*Life of Constantine the Great.* By Joseph Fletcher. 12mo. Pp. 124. London—Cockshaw. 1852.

THE life of Constantine the Great presents several perplexing problems. Strange as it may sound in the ears of some, there are many grave reasons for doubting the sincerity of his conversion to Christianity. If he were a secret enemy of the religion which he professed to adopt and patronize, he could not have hit on a better mode of injuring and corrupting it than his alliance of Christianity with the temporal power. Most truly does Mr. Fletcher observe, that the example which Constantine "set to princes of interfering between the consciences of subjects and their God, was followed by a long train of evils, which have proved a greater hindrance to the propagation of genuine Christianity than all the persecutions ever inflicted on its adherents." Mr. Fletcher has executed a not easy task with knowledge, taste and candour. His testimony to the merits of Gibbon is one of many recent testimonies to the historical fidelity and fulness of that extraordinary writer.

---

*Classical Selections from British Prose Writers, chiefly illustrative of the Principles of Intellectual, Civil and Religious Liberty; of Peace, Philanthropy and Social Advancement.* 12mo. Pp. 374. London—Cockshaw.

THERE is, we dare say, room, amidst the innumerable books of extracts, for this well-culled volume. Here and there we notice admission given to an inferior passage, but generally we recognize in every extract some excellence of subject or sentiment. If it was right, as we believe it was, in such a volume to admit passages from Channing, Curran, Burke, Washington Irving, Kosuth, Lamartine and Prince Albert, a more accurate title than *Selections from British Prose Writers* should have been devised. From a selection devoted in great measure to civil and religious liberty, Mrs. Barbauld ought not to have been excluded. From Lord Chatham's speeches and Bishop Hoadly's sermons, too, we could have selected passages as fine as any contained in this book. It is, we know, very easy to make objections of this kind; but we frankly admit it would not be easy to compile, on the whole, a better selection from English writers in behalf of Freedom, Peace and Progress.

---

*Report addressed to the Committee of the Liverpool Domestic Mission Society, by their Minister to the Poor, and presented at the Fifteenth Annual General Meeting of the Society.* 12mo. Pp. 59. London—Whitfield.

MR. BISHOP'S Reports are very remarkable documents, and well deserve the large attention they have received from benevolent men of various churches. They are conceived in the true Christian spirit—benignant, expansive, tender, yet wise and prudent. They are stored with facts of which the philanthropist may make good use. We rejoice to find that familiarity with sights and scenes of woe and crime does not blunt our Missionary's tenderness or his moral sense. The most remarkable, and to him most creditable, result of his extended intercourse with society in its lowest circles, is his increased conviction of the goodness which is to be found there. It is one of the results and punishments of a career of selfish indulgence, that a man contracts a feeling of scepticism of human virtue. It is the reward of a course of highminded philanthropy, that it gives better hopes and deeper love of one's fellow-creatures.

After some very beautiful introductory passages expressive of his happy experience of virtue amongst the poor, Mr. Bishop describes some remarkable

and affecting incidents which have fallen under his notice during the past year. He next gives a sketch of one day's work of visits to the sick, the sorrowful, the fallen and the dying, which well illustrate the prudence and the pure benevolence of his walk amongst his humble townsmen. In some very weighty observations which follow, Mr. Bishop records his sense of the importance of public worship to the virtue of the poor. His statistics on education are very melancholy. They prove that two-thirds of the children in the districts which he superintends are without school education, and are constantly exposed to the pestiferous education of the streets. Mr. Bishop, in passing, censures Mr. Baines, of Leeds, for some very untrustworthy statistics which he has put forward respecting the state of education in Liverpool, illustrating what is familiar to all statist, that returns got up to support a foregone conclusion are positively worthless. In Dr. Bigelow, of America, Mr. Bishop has found a benevolent coadjutor, and has received from him invaluable assistance in finding employment for reformed evil-doers, whose prospects at home were hopeless. Then follows a very interesting account of the places of amusement which most fascinate the working-classes of Liverpool—the results of his own personal observations. Until attractive, but at the same time innocent, recreations are offered to the acceptance of the young and the uneducated, we fear there is little prospect of weaning them from the amusements by which they are lured into casinos and beer-shops. Of the horrible miseries and crimes resulting from intemperance, our missionary gives us, as usual, strong examples. Against encouragement to mendicancy he repeats an emphatic warning. While artful impostors are extorting from the weakness of the higher class more than skilled labourers can earn, the missionary finds his dissuaves from mendicancy and imposture of little effect. We could quote from this valuable Report many pages, but must confine ourselves to the concluding portion, in which are described the consequences of the polemics which rage in Liverpool as bitterly as in any part of the kingdom.

“Polemical excitement has lost none of its virulence during the past year. It is astonishing, as well as grievous, to witness to what an extent religious (so-called) and political bitterness is found to prevail amongst some of the labouring classes; and, in most cases, the violence of the feeling is in proportion to the wickedness of the life. Men, who neglect their duties as husbands and fathers, who spend their earnings in the public-house, and allow their children to wander the streets, are ready, on the slightest provocation, to fight in the name of religion, and to treat with the greatest ferocity all who are of the opposite party. This will apply almost equally to certain sections of both Protestants and Catholics. The sight of a green ribbon on the one side, or an orange ribbon on the other, is sufficient to anger these foolish people into a state of frenzy. I have often had to remind such persons of the saying of William Penn, that ‘it were better to be of no church than to be bitter for any.’ The Orange procession of the 12th July rekindled all the dying embers of strife, and the flames still continue to rage. On the night after that procession I went both into Orange and Catholic districts where I was known, with the view of doing what I could to allay the evil spirit that had been raised, and was thus engaged till after midnight. Besides the collisions in the principal streets, many savage fights took place in more retired neighbourhoods, and in several courts I saw casements with nothing in them but shattered glass. From one house of disreputable character one of the wretched inmates was carried to the hospital with a broken arm, which she had got in one of these *religious* frays; for even that miserable class shared in the agitation, and ranged themselves on their respective sides. The feeling, as I have said, has not yet died away. Just at the close of the year I was requested to call and see a man who was one of the flag-bearers in the above procession. He had been drinking at a public-house, and was there reproached by some of the other party because of his share in the proceedings of the ‘carpenter lads,’ on Prince William’s day, and, after the usual taunts about the Pope and the confessional on the one side, and the character of Henry VIII. and his connexion with the Reformed Religion on the other, the flag-bearer was waylaid by several men as he left the house, who threw him down and kicked



him with such brutality that he had to be assisted, bruised and bleeding, by the police to his home, where he lay for a fortnight in a disabled state.

"An inoffensive and respectable woman, whom I know, was also very recently attacked, in mistake. Neither she nor her husband had ever taken any part in these senseless and disgraceful quarrels, but she was mistaken for a neighbour whose husband had been embroiled in them, and, whilst quietly engaged cleaning her doorstep, a woman rushed upon her with a poker and inflicted several serious wounds on her head.

"Such are the results in the courts and homes of the poor of the unholy polemical agitations which are too often promoted by those who have every means of knowing better, and for whom the same excuse cannot be alleged as we ought, perhaps, to make for the ignorant people, whose worst passions they stimulate into such ferocious activity.

"Even the very children catch in some degree the same evil spirit, and it is no unusual thing to hear little urchins propose 'three groans for the Pope,' or 'three groans for the Jumpers,' under which cognomen all Protestants are included. It is worthy of note that, soon after the 12th July, I saw a party of boys, varying in age from eight to fourteen years, armed with long sticks, with which they were getting up a mimic row, with all its movements and noises. One of the little fellows pretended to be felled by a blow on the head received from one of his companions. There he lay, apparently stunned. They came about him and pretended to raise him. He dropped his hands, and arms, and legs, exactly as if he had been senseless, and they laid him out as if they would carry him to the hospital. In what a school, thought I, are these children being educated! And what can be expected of them when they *feel* the passions which they thus horribly mimic? Oh, when will this spirit of foul antipathy be laid, and man differ from man as brother from brother? Not till a more lowly and charitable demeanour, and a less proud and arrogant spirit, are manifested by the leaders of sects and parties. The feeling that prompts the educated man to the use of injurious words, will urge the ignorant man to resort to wounding blows."—Pp. 45—47.

---

*The Revolution of our Years: a Sermon for the Year 1851.* By J. H. Ryland, Bradford, Yorkshire. 12mo. Pp. 16. London—Whitfield.

MR. RYLAND'S occasional discourse is earnest, patriotic and devout. The year 1851 furnishes, in fact, to the enlightened Christian minister many noble and heart-stirring topics. In no spirit of selfish nationalism does Mr. Ryland contemplate the happy position of England—free and Protestant England—compared with other European nations, bowed down beneath military and spiritual despotism. Let this short passage suffice as a specimen:

"The year began with the mischiefs of a blind re-action against the *religious* progress of the times; it closes, thus, with one against their *civil* march. The two, indeed, in impious league, now unite for the oppression of mankind; and the Church that originated the one, that boasted Catholic and Apostolic Church, is at this moment giving God thanks for the grand iniquity of the other. Will such prayers, think they, be heard in heaven? No! O blessed junction of civil and religious liberty in our land! Pray God, indeed, it were 'all the world over.' Thrice happy Country, that by its early struggles has won their supremacy for itself; for others; in time for all! and that has done something more; has shewn that without the things in heaven, the things on earth cannot be enjoyed,—that *freedom towards God is alone equal to achieve the liberty of Man*. Grand testimony of England and the nation sprung from her in the very act, alike to Christianity, and the marvellous excellence of the human nature for which Christianity was vouchsafed!"—Pp. 10, 11.

## INTELLIGENCE.

---

*Calcutta.*

[We are permitted by Rev. Edward Tagart to make public the interesting letter that follows, recently addressed to him by our accomplished countryman, Dr. Bowring.]

Calcutta, 7th January, 1852.

My dear Sir,—I dare say it will interest you to hear something of that body of distinguished men who were associated with the name, and are still associated with the memory, of Rammohun Roy. His son (not the adopted who was in England), but his legitimate son, Rumapunaud Roy, occupies a very high and influential position in Calcutta,—somewhat resembling that of the Attorney-General at home,—being the Government Valert, or Advocate, practising in the Supreme Court of Appeal, the Judder Adawler, where I have heard him plead with equal sagacity and readiness both in Bengali and English. He has a practice scarcely less lucrative than that of our most popular barristers. I have enjoyed so much of his society, received from him so very many kind attentions, and have formed so high an estimate of his intellectual capacity and social influence, that it gratified me much to hear him, and other of his associate Brahmins of high caste, express regret that no communications now take place between his father's friends, or members of the Unitarian community, and the Hindu religious reformers in India. It is quite true that they do not profess a belief in Christianity or in the miracles of its founder; but they call themselves Unitarians, they abhor idolatry in all its forms, they worship a Godhead purely spiritual, and believe in the immortality of the soul. I attended their religious services, which were conducted with much reverence and devotion. The building, in a very crowded part of populous Calcutta, is applied in its lower stories to the printing and publication of their Bengali periodical, which is now extensively circulated and has a considerable sale. This work is intended to promulgate and defend their doctrines, which are now professed by a considerable body of natives in various parts of India, having their places of worship, their teachers and their own organization, and I am assured

they are producing a wide and a deep impression on the Hindu mind. It is to be regretted that, instead of welcoming the advent of so much of truth and light,—instead of considering these interpreters of the *Vaidanta* as marching towards correct notions as to a spiritual divinity, and *therefore* towards a recognition of the Deity as revealed in our sacred books,—orthodox divines have been pleased to denounce them as practically promulgating a system of Atheism, and to confound their nobler and purer faith either with gross idolatry or the negation of the Supreme Being. Against such injustice they vehemently and loudly protest, and protest with the most conclusive reasonings. It is not my present object to do more than to claim for them that sympathy which every lover of truth owes to every searcher after truth, but you will like to hear something of their religious services.

They are conducted in the highest story of the edifice, which is accessible on all sides. The chapel is oblong, with rows of seats from the two ends gradually descending towards a marble floor in the centre, on one side of which are three marble steps, on whose top stand two marble tables, behind which sit two Pundits, clad in long scarlet garments, bare-headed, who are the expositors and preachers of the temple. Immediately opposite them is a raised circular and projecting platform (carpeted), on which the "choristers" are seated. There were two of these who sang the hymns of the day to the accompaniment of an ancient stringed instrument, something resembling a large guitar with a protruding body, and a drum like a long barrel, struck by the hand at its two ends, while it rested on the musician's knees. The service began by an invocation, which was followed by a chant. The recitative was often employed in the course of the services, the most important part of which was the reading of a Sanscrit text, which was sung to an ancient air by the whole congregation; after a translation into Bengali, one of the Pundits read a commentary, explaining and elucidating the meaning, which occupied about a quarter of an hour; at the conclusion of which, the other Pundit took up the subject and gave

his annotations, at about an equal length. A long pause ensued, which seemed devoted to silent meditation, and then the choristers touched their instruments and sang a long hymn. I was not able to remain to the end, but I understand the services last from two hours to two hours and a half, and are held usually on Wednesday evenings. The front seats are occupied by Brahmins of high caste, but I learnt that Hindus of the inferior castes are in the habit of attending, and that there is not the slightest impediment to their reception. The congregation varies from a hundred to five hundred persons, and is of course confined to the male sex.

Yours very truly,

JOHN BOWRING.

---

*A Sign of the Times.*

We reprint the following from a cutting taken from a recent Cornish newspaper. Whether the Rev. remonstrants be of High or Low Church we do not know; assuredly they are of a divided Church. The ambiguous language of the Dean intimates a tendency equally to the Arminian and Arian heresies, and as he rather contemptuously refuses to be catechised by his ecclesiastical subordinates, we are left in a disagreeable doubt whom we are to recognize as displaying legitimate authority and sound doctrine. To the venerated of the Church, a sad spectacle!

THE ATHANASIAN CREED AND THE DEAN OF EXETER.—Much excitement has been produced in clerical circles in this diocese by a letter addressed to the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, signed by five of the Exeter clergy, which was called forth by a sermon preached by that dignitary in the cathedral as far back as Christmas-day. It appears that there were some expressions in the discourse which gave rise to a report that the Dean had impugned the teaching of the Athanasian Creed. The matter was considered of so much importance that five of the Exeter clergy addressed the following letter to the Dean:

“January 5, 1852.

“Very Rev. and dear Sir,—It is with great pain that we feel constrained to address you in consequence of a report which has been widely circulated in this city, touching a sermon preached by you on Christmas-day in the cathedral, and which, unfortunately, is believed by very many. It is stated that, on that occasion, you said or used words

to this effect, ‘That we did not meet here to anathematize those who differed from us by over-precise or presumptuous definitions of doctrine made by fallible men;’ and also, ‘It would have been wiser and better for the Church if the Athanasian Creed, instead of commencing with its present declaration, had begun by saying, ‘Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he lead a good life.’—Certain it is, that an extensive impression among those who heard your sermon was, that it impugned the teaching of the Athanasian Creed, and was listened to with equal surprise and concern as coming from you.—Knowing, as many of us do by experience, how much sermons, when preached, are liable to an unintentional misrepresentation, we think it but due to you to bring this subject before you, in the hope that you will empower us publicly to contradict a report so injurious to yourself and the Church.—We need scarcely assure you that in making this communication we disclaim all intention of assuming authority, and are influenced by no other desire than that of counteracting the ill effects to which the existing impression has given rise.—With every sentiment of respect and regard, we remain, venerable, reverend, and dear Sir, your faithful servants,

“SACKVILLE LEE.

“CH. CH. BARTHOLOMEW.

“JOSEPH T. TOYE.

“C. R. ROPER.

“J. LINCOLN GALTON.”

The foregoing letter was delivered to the Dean by two of the above clergy.

In his reply the reverend gentleman says—“It certainly was not my intention to impugn, either directly or indirectly, any fundamental truth of the Gospel; and the doctrine of our Lord’s incarnation, on which the occasion led me chiefly to dwell, was stated, as I hoped, with such clearness as to obviate all danger of my faith in that doctrine being mistaken or misrepresented.” He also asserts that not one of the five clergy who signed the letter was present, but had relied on a vague rumour. Nor had they “condescended to inform him in what way he had impugned the teaching of the Athanasian Creed.” He concludes by drawing their attention to the charitable admonition of the son of Sirach, “Blame not before thou hast examined the truth; understand first and then rebuke.”



*Birmingham Unitarian Brotherly Society.*

At the annual meeting of the members and friends of the above Society, held on Sunday evening, the 4th of January, 1852, in the upper school-room, New Meeting Street, the following reports were read and unanimously adopted:

The total number of pupils belonging to the different schools in connection with the Society is, males, 1169; females, 658; total, males and females, 1827. The number of teachers, males, 198; females, 74; total, males and females, 272.

The number of books in the libraries is 7387, and there has been 19,734 exchanged during the year. The average charge made to pupils is one halfpenny per volume per week.

The Savings' Club has 1152 depositors, who have deposited during the year £594. 16s. 4d., and the amount repaid to depositors is £549. 8s. 8d. The smallest sum received in one deposit is one halfpenny, and the largest forty shillings.

The Benefit Sick Society in connection with the above institution has 393 subscribers, and the amount of subscriptions received during the past year, 1851, was £187. 11s. 0½d.; the amount paid for sickness and three funerals during the year, £127. 13s. 5d.; also sundry expenses and surgeon's salary, £26. 13s. The interest received on the capital invested is £207. 5s. 10d.; this added to the savings on the subscriptions, gives an increase to the funds of £238. 16s. 5d., which, with the capital at the last annual meeting (£4030. 9s.), makes the present capital of the Society £4269. 5s. 5d. This branch of the institution has been established fifty-three years, and the rate of payment in case of sickness is 2s. per week for every halfpenny subscribed, the amount of subscription being limited from one halfpenny to fourpence per week, thus giving an allowance in sickness to a senior subscriber of fourpence, the sum of 16s. per week, with the addition of medical attendance and medicines, which is believed to be the largest amount paid by any existing Society, as compared with the rate of payment.

At the close of the reports, an address was delivered by one of the members; the subject was, "What have the Events of the Year 1851 done for the People?"

*Unitarian Church, Birkenhead.*

The Rev. RUSSELL LANT CARPENTER,

B.A., having completed his temporary engagement, has accepted the cordial and unanimous invitation to become the settled minister of this new congregation.

*Ministers' Salaries.*

Mr. Frederick Russell has published in the *Inquirer* a table, which we sub-join, giving the result, so far as the salaries of ministers are concerned, of the circular issued by the late much-lamented Mr. James Russell, of Birmingham.

£400 to £450 .. 1	£90 to £95 .. 3
350 — 400 .. 1	85 — 90 .. 2
300 — 350 .. 3	80 — 85 .. 9
265 — 275 .. 1	75 — 80 .. 3
245 — 255 .. 2	70 — 75 .. 6
225 — 235 .. 1	65 — 70 .. 3
205 — 215 .. 3	60 — 65 .. 13
195 — 205 .. 3	55 — 60 .. 5
175 — 185 .. 2	50 — 55 .. 4
165 — 175 .. 1	45 — 50 .. 3
155 — 165 .. 4	40 — 45 .. 2
145 — 155 .. 11	35 — 40 .. 4
135 — 145 .. 4	30 — 35 .. 3
125 — 135 .. 3	25 — 30 .. 6
115 — 125 .. 8	20 — 25 .. 7
105 — 115 .. 4	15 — 20 .. 1
100 — 105 .. 20	10 — 15 .. 3
95 — 100 .. 2	5 — 10 .. 3

This table shews, that while the average income of 158 Unitarian ministers is below £103, there are 86, the average of whose salaries is below £54 per annum. That is to say, after having received an education at an average cost of not less than £1000, they receive less than any skilled mechanic in full work. With such a melancholy fact staring us in the face, can we wonder that our Colleges languish for lack of divinity students, and that congregations find it difficult to fill their pulpits?

*Meetings.*—The annual meeting of the Manchester District Sunday-School Association, which will be held at Dukinfield on Good Friday, promises to be of unusual interest.

On the same day (we believe at three o'clock in the afternoon), the Christian Brethren of Mossley will have a public meeting to lay the corner-stone of their new chapel and school-room. We are glad to learn that James Heywood, Esq., M.P., has consented to perform this office for them.

## OBITUARY.

Jan. 21, at Tottenham, London, in her 75th year, Mrs. MAURICE, formerly of Stourbridge.

Jan. 25, at Walsall, in his 87th year, Rev. THOMAS BOWEN.

Feb. 1, at the house of his uncle, John Reid, Esq., Newland Valley, near Monmouth, in his 34th year, KENRICK, second son of the late Thomas Whitehead REID, Esq., of Hampstead, Middlesex.

Feb. 9, at Paisley, Mr. CHRISTOPHER DUNLOP, in the 55th year of his age. The town of Paisley was long ago celebrated for the intelligence, thrift and industry of its weaving population. Few of the cottages were deficient in a collection of well-assorted books. Politics and theology commanded steadfast and earnest thinkers. It was one of the earliest stations of the Unitarian cause. A congregation founded by men in humble circumstances, and ministered to by persons selected out of their own number, has assembled for the sole worship of the Father in the name of Christ, for at least sixty years. The parents of Christopher Dunlop were attendants on this society, and his mind early opened to a reception and love of the distinctive principles it maintained. Receiving his elementary instruction at one of the common schools of his native town, he was not one of those who act as if education finished with school-time. In his view, it was the business of life; and his practice corresponded with his theory. He was a self-educating man, and few have availed themselves more earnestly of the facilities of knowledge which the last half century has presented. His mind was well stored with varied information, and out of his abundance he gladly communicated to others. His was pre-eminently a Christian mind. Its principles he knew in their purity, and they guided all his actions. With the evidences of the truth and divinity of the religion of Christ he was intimately conversant. Its divine spirit of love prompted his daily walk and conversation. Religion, with him, was no mere intellectual abstraction; it was his life. In 1823, he became a member of the Paisley Unitarian church, and was ever

sedulous in the promotion of its welfare. In 1833, he began his public ministrations as one of its pastors. Engaged in the laborious duties of daily industrial and mechanical employment, he yet found leisure for preparing religious exercises, which were always enlightened, earnest, Christian. Not alone in Paisley did these services find acceptance, but in Glasgow, Edinburgh, Greenock, Carlisle, Girvan, Tillicoultry, Falkirk, &c. In all the congregations he was welcomed as a friend and coadjutor in every good word and work. The moral and political reform movements of the age found in him an upright and unflinching advocate. The drinking customs of Scotland, he saw, were the source of incalculable evils and demoralization; and he felt it a Christian duty to labour for their abrogation. He assisted in founding the first Total Abstinence Society in that country. It was formed at a meeting convened in the Unitarian meeting-house of Paisley, in 1836, and the first individual who signed the pledge was himself. Friendly Equitable Societies, for mutual relief in sickness and poverty, had in him an earnest supporter. He founded "The Paisley Evergreen Equitable Institution." Wherever good could be done, Christopher Dunlop was ready with his aid. In every effort to spread Christian truth, he joined heart and soul. With the modesty of true worth, he was naturally self-diffident and retiring, but brought out by the force of circumstances and conscious duty; and no man was better qualified to lead the onslaught on error, or defend the truth in Christ Jesus. Blessed with a faithful helpmeet and a numerous and promising family, his delight was in the sanctuary of home. The sabbath saw him in the midst, in the house of God; and whether in public or private, his every-day walk and conversation attracted esteem and won respect and affection. His last illness was trying, but it was endured with calm resignation to the will of the Father. He looked on death, not with alarm, but with hopeful vision: Christ had destroyed its dread, and the power of the Resurrection was felt in his soul. The friends who honoured him gathered round in his sickness, and amongst others, the Rev. J. C. Woods, of Edin-



burgh. The closing hours were calm and peaceful, full of consolation and holy hope. There be those in many of our churches in Great Britain who will call to mind the friendly greeting and Christian fellowship of the departed. The church which has lost a faithful pastor will embalm his memory, and his family will hallow it in their hearts.

Feb. 22, at Brixton Rise, after a short illness, THOMAS BROWN, Esq., aged 67. The deceased was a native of Wareham, in Dorsetshire. On his removal to London about the year 1812, he became a member of the Old Jewry chapel, under the ministry of the late Dr. Abraham Rees, in whose religious opinions he fully agreed, and to whom he was much attached both as a preacher and a man. Though firm in his own views of Christian truth, he was tolerant to all those who differed from him. Among his acquaintance were men of various creeds and opinions, with whom he lived on the most friendly terms, and by whom he was much respected. The writer of this brief notice had known him for many years, and found him the same man to the last,—the opponent of bigotry and intolerance, and the firm, consistent friend of civil and religious liberty. Averse as he was to all panegyric upon the dead, it is but just to his memory to add, that the simplicity of his character and the kindness of his heart had won for him the esteem and regard of a numerous circle of friends.

March 1, at Newchurch, Rossendale, JOHN ASHWORTH, in the 72nd year of his age, late minister of the Unitarian chapel, Newchurch.

We hope in some future number to give a memoir of our departed friend. At present we must content ourselves with a few words on his character.

He was an example of singular integrity and honesty. This manifested itself in his investigation and profession of truth, and resulted in his yielding up, at a great cost of feeling, the opinions and friendships of his early religious life. Convinced of the errors of the orthodox system (Wesleyan Methodism), in which he had been educated, he felt it his duty openly to renounce them, and to expound and defend opinions "everywhere spoken against," but dear to him, as constituting the beauty and glory of "the faith once delivered to the saints." In

reference to all human authorities aiming to stifle his honest declaration of what he deemed the "truth as it is in Jesus," his was the determination of the ancient apostles—"Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." The consideration that weighed with him, and that guided his conduct, was the conviction of truth and the approval of God.

His strict regard for truth and honesty breathed a spirit of directness and honour through the whole of his worldly transactions; for though a minister of the gospel, he was during the greater part of his life engaged in a secular calling, it being a cherished object with him to preach the gospel as far as possible free from charge. His uprightness in his worldly dealings was obvious to all. Every one felt that he could have trusted anything to his integrity and honour. His sterling worth in this respect gained sincere regard where there was no tie of theological sympathy, and secured universal esteem.

Our venerated friend was, in the next place, distinguished for zeal. It is true there was no loud profession, no enthusiastic platform display; but there was quiet, steady, persevering, self-sacrificing labour from day to day, from month to month, from year to year; and he resigned not life but with his weapon in his hand and his armour bright. His last public labours took place only a few days before his death, when he deeply interested the brethren at Padiham by a discourse on the appropriate concluding text of such a life—"No man liveth to himself."

His labours in the whole of the district, but particularly among the members of his congregation at Newchurch, were disinterested, unaffected, elevating, we might almost say apostolic. With what simple and earnest piety did he for so many years lead their devotions, and appeal to their understandings and their consciences! With what unassuming kindness and affection did he mingle in the society of their daily life, ever ready to give the aid of his clear understanding to their difficulties, and of his devout sympathy in their sicknesses and sorrows! Not by them alone, however, is this loss felt. Those of like history and of like precious faith in Padiham, Rawtenstall and Rochdale, have lost a true friend and champion. Others, too, feel the bereavement. No minister in our body



secured more general and cordial respect and esteem. His different publications in the honest, manly and candid defence of scriptural truth, and his general character, had caused his name to be associated with Christian uprightness and love, and to be familiar to all interested in our principles.

His characteristic humility did not depart from him in his last illness. He had a most firm belief in immortality, based upon the apostolic argument of Christ's resurrection from the dead. In the immediate prospect of his dissolution, he remarked to a friend at his bed-side, "I have no fear; it is true I am a poor, unworthy, unprofitable servant, but I trust in the mercy and goodness of my Heavenly Father, through Christ Jesus."

"Mark the perfect man and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace."

March 18, in his 82nd year, THOMAS OLIVERS WARWICK, M. D. He was the son of a very respectable minister amongst the Wesleyan Methodists. The son early in life quitted the Methodist communion, and proceeded to the academy at Northampton, then conducted by Mr. Horsey. The system of instruction pursued by Mr. Horsey, which Unitarian writers have praised and "Orthodox" writers have censured, was so impartial, that he cautiously abstained from giving any bias to his pupils, and scarcely allowed them to ascertain in the lecture-room his individual opinions on controverted theological questions. The result in the case of Mr. Warwick was, his adoption of liberal opinions. On quitting the academy, he accepted an invitation, in 1795, from the Presbyterian congregation of Rotherham, in Yorkshire. The pulpit had been previously occupied by Rev. William Allard, afterwards of Bury, in Lancashire. With the full consent of his flock, he entered on a course of preparatory study for the medical profession, which he thought

of uniting with the ministry. During the years 1797—1799, his studies were continued at the University of Edinburgh and the hospitals of London. During his absence from Yorkshire, his pulpit was supplied, amongst others, by Rev. Mr. Evans, after he had resigned his pulpit at Sheffield. In the course of his medical studies, he felt very deep interest in the department of Chemistry, especially in its application to the arts. He was induced to join an extensive concern for the manufacture of articles used in dyeing. He also acquired considerable reputation at this time by the delivery of popular lectures on Chemistry at Sheffield, Nottingham and other places. Great as was his scientific skill, he had not the necessary qualifications for commercial matters. The failure of his manufacturing speculation occasioned, about the end of 1816, his removal from Rotherham, where he was succeeded by Rev. Jacob Brettell. He did not for some time give up the practice of preaching. During a temporary vacancy, he supplied the pulpit at Dukinfield. For many years he resided at Manchester, and turned his scientific knowledge to good account as a practical chemist. He also visited most places of England as a scientific lecturer. He married Mary Aldred, the youngest daughter of Ebenezer Aldred, of Wakefield, by Mary, daughter of Rev. Samuel Moulton, of Rotherham. His latter days were passed under the roof of one of his daughters, Mrs. Ames, of Abercrombie Terrace, Liverpool. The scientific pursuits which had occupied the greater part of his life, formed the amusement of his age. He took considerable interest in some local Philosophical Societies, and sometimes contributed to their transactions. As a minister he had long ceased to officiate.

March 20, aged 60, MARTHA AMELIA, relict of the late Mr. William COWLING, merchant, York.

## MARRIAGES.

Feb. 29, at the Unitarian chapel, Shepton Mallet, by Rev. J. B. Bristowe, Mr. BENJAMIN PIKE to JANE GEORGE, both of that town.

March 25, at the Presbyterian meeting, Evesham, Worcestershire, THOMAS ALCOCK, Esq., of Hyde, Cheshire, second son of John Alcock, Esq., of Gat-

ley Hill, Cheshire, to SARAH MARIA, only daughter of the late ANTHONY NEW, Esq., of Evesham.

March 13, at Little Portland-Street chapel, London, by Rev. Thos. Madge, JAMES THORNELEY, Esq., solicitor, of Liverpool, to LAURA, daughter of the late Robert Roscoe, Esq.